

Book 2: Fix the World

Introduction

You see things everywhere that can and should be better. It's a world ripe for improvement.

If world has changed but what you're doing hasn't changed, you're fucking up we have improvements in voting technology and voting hasn't changed. The world is entirely different more different than it's ever been, well perhaps in the future direction. In the past maybe the volcanoes and dinosaurs was more different than now. But the education system has not changed a bit. Neither has politics, lots of things with lots of momentum and too many committees to pivot haven't change much.

There's actually a guidebook from the CIA apparently on how to cripple a company you work for by "bike shedding it" where you get as many people on a committee as possible and try to have them argue about the smallest of items. There's even a rule named after the way that committees fail it's called (xx's rule). Whereas the scope of a project gets larger and larger, the arguments will increasingly be about smaller and smaller parts of it, because the giant numbers are so big that no one has anything to say about them, but the smaller items that they are used to dealing with are easier for them to get a handle on, and feel that they can optimize. I think that law was first noticed when they were analyzing how the building process went for a nuclear reactor, not so many arguments about the reactor, but lots about the color of things. xx look up source.

Sort

Speed limits

<https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=14196812>

<https://priceconomics.com/is-every-speed-limit-too-low/>

Tragedy of marketing

Efficient companies that give you a good price can't afford to market to you, but the scams can

Politics

Take the D and R off the names on ballots, if you don't know their positions, they don't deserve a cheat sheet!

The most important things cost 10 times what they used to, and the quality has gone down, and no one knows why

<https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=13613687>

<http://slatestarcodex.com/2017/02/09/considerations-on-cost-disease/>

Immigration

Every nation's default position is "go screw yourself." If you want to move to another nation, you need be attractive enough to one of their citizens to become married or attractive enough to get a job over local applicants or attending school. Otherwise, you're told to fuck off. Perhaps some extremely small portion of global immigration is of the refugee sort, and it's supposed to be temporary.

The fantasy that nations are more friendly than they are is the result of most commenters never trying to emigrate anywhere else.

Would you rather have free education (like every other successful country) or a wall that stops no one from flying, driving, boating over and overstaying their visa. Real law enforcement does not look like a wall. Real investigators catch real criminals. Invest in tools that work.

From <https://www.reddit.com/r/worldnews/comments/5sxjrx/this_is_not_a_christian_gesture_pope_francis/>
I like courage. I like useful people immigrating. I realize the huddled masses didn't use to wear suicide vests. I realize the huddled masses didn't cut off clits as a ritual. Not all masses that are huddled have the same risk/reward ratio. I say bring all the good honest families and refugees you can bare, however don't pretend that every refugee nor immigrant is the same, for that would be ignorant of their identities as individuals, and perhaps members of psychotic groups.

From <https://www.reddit.com/r/worldnews/comments/5sxjrx/this_is_not_a_christian_gesture_pope_francis/>

I agree with the vast majority of what you've saying, I also notice there's some very bad places in this world, and what is making them bad isn't the people at the top of them. Unless you have vigilance, nations can regress. There's more than enough awesome immigrants to go around that you need not take the worst of the bunch. Refugees are obviously a special case, and as you said, extremely well vetted already. Oddly enough however, once your extremely well vetted refugees are nice and settled in, their cousin bad hombre comes to visit for a month sometimes. Thus, a foothold no matter how innocent can sometimes turn into the horror that you see in the streets of Nice and Berlin.

From <https://www.reddit.com/r/worldnews/comments/5sxjrx/this_is_not_a_christian_gesture_pope_francis/>

Cash is national security.

When there's civil unrest, or war, all the permission channels are going to go down. Cash is freedom.

Virtual reality, VR

I think VR is garbage. You take what would be a decent visual experience, and stretch it across your field of vision until it's nice and pixelated. Then you cut that crap resolution in half, by giving each eye its own individual feed.

Now that you've got the resolution lowered by 10 fold or so, you can induce sickness with lag, head tracking inaccuracy, poorly executed strobing to reduce blur.

Now that you're sickly enjoying the screendoor'd world, your can enjoy the face sweat, and not being able to find your beverage in the real world.

I can live with everything but the screen door.

Amazon, ebay etc

Need search review, by number of reviews, by age, newer, more common is better than rare or old (multiply the stats)

Aligning incentives to focus on lasting value

You can predict the outcome by looking at the rules of the game. If you reward bad behavior, you will get more of it. If you punish good behavior, you will get less of it.

Musicians

are paid most to not make great new music. It would be great if musicians made more money on producing amazing music than they do performing it for crowds of people in specific locations. Live musical performances only benefit the few people that can attend. When you create amazing music, it can transcend generations and leave an impact on the world long after you're dead. Sadly, this misalignment in profit makes it so there's much less great music in the world, because the artists are out there putting 100 percent into their gigs, and transition time to get from one gig to the next. How much time in the studio making the best music they can dream up do you think they're doing when they are on tour? Not much. You can't be in the studio when you're on stage or sleeping.

Prisoners: Rehabilitate, don't habituate.

The prison industrial complex. Would you rather have lots of arrests of criminals, or no arrests, but no crime? Obviously no crime is better than crime and arrests, however that's not how we reward the police! Would you rather have full prisons, or empty prisons, due to no crime. Empty, obviously, but the private corps that own the prisons, and all their

suppliers would really prefer full prisons, they like a revolving door of criminal customers. Get out, get caught, get back in your cage.

Wars:

Some megacorp executives want a new boats, so some brown people are gonna have to die in a place you've never been.

The Military industrial complex

If you bomb manufacturer, and no one is dropping your bombs on other people, how are you going to stay in business? They have a long shelf life, so, unless they're getting used on a regular basis, you go out of business. I guess someone has to be getting blown up, or it will hurt the parts of the economy that thrive on war, and consequently misery.

Retask the trained killers of men.

What would happen if the good exterminators of men were sent back to boot camp for a couple weeks on how to "build houses" and you'd get carpenter, or masonry, or plumbing based on your aptitude, just like you would get infantry, or sniper, or perhaps what you requested, just like the first boot camp. I say houses because, we do live in a nation xx(regionalized) where, the vast majority of homes are owned by banks instead of men, because men can't afford homes any longer. Also, being a nail banger or bricklayer is simple enough that nearly anyone can do it if taught. So we have desperately needed shelter combined with rather easy to teach skills to fulfill it. It could be a recipe for success. Surely there's better things the good, young americans of the world can be doing here at home, than the blowing up of other young brown people somewhere you're unlikely to ever see in this life.

Overpreparation to the point of neglecting other areas is a thing, and it's a thing we're doing worse in America than any other country on the planet.

Marketing Pollution

Misaligned values and all the negative results

Program sponsors and advertisers versus content consumers. They want you to spend more time on site, you should want to spend less. They want you to spend money on things you don't need, you should spend on things you do need. They need you to watch, and you like conflict, violence, us vs them mentality. If it bleeds, it leads. Politically, its maximization of conflict and minimization of agreement. This is the definition of polarization. Which makes compromise and progress harder to achieve. Hell, where they can't find the conflict they want, they'll just misunderstand or miss portray the situation or arguments to create a conflict.

Oftentimes however, one party is so wrong that any compromise would be bad. For instance, war. What if half congress wanted to go to war, and the other half didn't want to. Should they half go to war? Better to win and win fast, or not go at all. This is the reason you have photo slideshows on the internet when you have to click next instead of just scrolling. They don't get to inflate their page views if you scroll instead of click. This is why you have advertisement buttons as close as possible to other things you actually do want to press, because sometimes you will slip, and they will make money on it. This is why when you open your magazine, ads fall out of it, so you have to clean pick them up and see them. This is why commercials are louder than television shows. And why there's so many commercials. Ever have the privilege of watching the same commercial 10 times during a broadcast on the internet because they couldn't sell enough inventory to have another ad to show you? It's not so fun.

These marketing people are making the world a much worse place. Waste your time, show you the worst versions of the world, and inspire you to do nothing but spend as much time watching as possible and spend as much money as possible on whatever garbage they're

promoting. Ever notice websites get worse and worse to navigate? Instead of optimizing for the best possible experience, say on a large screen, they optimize for what most people use, which is a terribly small screen.

Sites that used to show you lots of content at once, where you didn't have to hit page down 100 times, now you have to hit page down 100 times, and even worse, click next and wait, or even not use a button called next, but a button called "older". Listen website, it may be older to you, but since I read left to right and top to bottom, it's actually next to me, and newer to me, because I just detected it. Focus on me instead of you. Next, not older. Make everyone's lives easier. Let's all use next and back, instead of whatever proprietary special idea you have that. In opera if I hit the end of a page and hit space bar, it auto clicks "next" it doesn't auto click, "older."

Advertising for people to do the wrong thing via perverse incentives

If you're advertising for people to do the wrong thing, you're killing the mother earth that birthed you. You're killing the system you live in. You're making the world that you live in, a worse place. To some degree, that shittiness will come back to you. Probably nowhere near as close to the profit you make on causing it. Sadly. That's the tragedy of the commons. If somebody gets to externalize the cost of destroying the environment and make extra profit, that's a great idea for them.

R188

Marketing has giant cultural effects

People think Santa traditionally wears red because of Coca-Cola

No. It's widely believed that today's [Santa](#) wears a red suit because that's the color associated with Coca-Cola, but this isn't the case. Before the Coca-Cola Santa was even created, St Nick had appeared in numerous illustrations and written descriptions wearing a scarlet coat. However, it is true that [Coca-Cola advertising](#) played a big role in shaping the jolly, rotund character we know and love today. In 1931, Coca-Cola commissioned Swedish-American artist Haddon Sundblom to paint Santa Claus for the company's Christmas adverts. Prior to this, Santa had been portrayed in a variety of ways throughout history: tall and gaunt; short and elfin; distinguished and intellectual; even downright frightening.

Sundblom's paintings for Coca-Cola established Santa as a warm, happy character with human features such as rosy cheeks, a white beard, twinkling eyes and laughter lines. This grandfather-style Coca-Cola Santa captivated the public and, as our adverts spread globally, the perception of the North Pole's most-famous resident changed forever.

From <<http://www.coca-cola.co.uk/fag/rumours/is-it-true-santa-is-red-because-of-coca-cola/>>

Diamonds in wedding rings

Although the tradition of giving a ring to the woman who has promised to become your bride goes back centuries, diamond engagement rings are a relatively recent innovation. Diamond engagement rings first became popular in the 1930s. By 1965, 80 percent of all new brides in the United States sported one.

From <<https://www.americangemsociety.org/the-history-of-the-diamond-as-an-engagement-ring>>

In the 1930s, when demand for diamond rings declined in the U.S. during hard economic times, the De Beers Company began an aggressive marketing campaign using photographs of glamorous movie stars swathed in diamonds. Within three years, the sales of diamonds had increased by 50 percent. In 1947, De Beers launched

its now classic slogan, "A Diamond is Forever."

From <<https://www.americangemsociety.org/the-history-of-the-diamond-as-an-engagement-ring>>

Beans

Why do the English eat beans for breakfast? More at:

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2407890/Beanz-ages-How-Heinz-adverts-adapted-60-years-try-capture-changing-mood-nation.html>

Listicles

Sticking a number in the title of your book works from a marketing perspective because people think, ash, if I read this, I'll have a pretty complete view of what's going on in this area that's important to me so let's grab it. Imagine if the title was more accurate, such as 40 of the millions of good strategies to gain power. Or 7 of the hundreds of good habits successful people have. Sales would fall. Perhaps I should have called this book X things you need to know right now to win at life. Where x equaled the number of chapters I felt like writing. Heck maybe that's even a good idea?

Marketing headlines.

The endless sea of brand marketing with no ability to capitalize on it, I saw an advertisement for a high-rise building in Miami, no phone number, no address, no city. In an inflight magazine it was quite the sight to see in a full page ad. What could their highest and best outcome of that advertisement be? The humor value I get laughing at it? More at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Betteridge%27s_law_of_headlines

Why it's ok to block ads

More at: <http://blog.practicaethics.ox.ac.uk/2015/10/why-its-ok-to-block-ads/>

Hero worship

If your ever curious how this hero worship and cult of personality occurs, measure the number of hours you've watched somebody like Brad Pitt or Leonardo DiCaprio explaining to you who they are in that roll explaining to you their problems, overcoming their problems and having greatness in their life and then measure the number of hours that you have seen, felt, been associated with, listened to and looked at Batman and then compare it with loved ones.

Over the last 5 or 6 years how much time have you seen your father explaining a situation to you, working through that situation, finding ways to overcome it, overcoming it and growing from it and then compare that to popular musicians, popular actors. In the world that we live in today with social media and hero worship and gossip magazines, these fake personas invented by screen writers, executed by professional actors through the lens of professional cinematographers and musicians and you know score writers and I can't remember the name of the people who make music for film.

We are more exposed to those virtual and 30 foot, 40 foot tall on a movie screen optimized for every single word that comes out of their mouth, those people as opposed to the real people in the real world, who don't say optimized things and who aren't 40 feet tall and who don't have theme music than plays when they walk down the streets. Perhaps, we should just take advantage of some of what the arts have done to addicts us and give us draw in our life and use it for ourselves.

Maybe you should let your friends and loved ones in on what you're dealing with and how you might overcome it or maybe you should you know pay attention to your loved ones. To tell you the truth, I don't know how your loved ones can compete with some of the stories that are out there because god damn their interesting.

In summary, if you want to have an impact on this world and you don't have enough

money, you can pretty much fuck yourself because the world isn't paying attention to what it should be. The world is paying attention to what it wants and on the other side of that one is a well-oiled multibillion dollar machine built to addict, built to consume, built to give them what they want regardless of what is [inaudible 2: 47] or not. If you want to influence your friends, your family and you then you need the money to out compete those other experts that have taken over your consciousness.

R502 & QE.502

The tragedy of marketing

how many truly important things do you see advertised? how tragic that the scams can afford to penetrative your consciousness but the genuine and useful cannot. You ever notice how on airlines, the magazines are all about places where they can take you. Exotic far away destinations that cost the maximum amount to travel to. Coincidence? How many wholesome and good things really get advertised? Amplifying our misguided and basal human nature by super normal stimulation isn't healthy for us as a species. To exaggerate the idea, what if we started adopting and marketing crack instead of combatting it? Isn't to some degree the marketing of terribly unhealthy things similar?

Why great ideas fail to spread

In order for an idea to spread, it needs to be able to fund its own virility. The reason that we see so many more advertisements for useless crap, is because people are willing to part with their money for useless crap much more than they are to part with their money for useful things. It's rather the tragedy of the commons. In practice the useless crap that you buy off the for sale on television advertisement is better than the money that you give to a charity!?! Wat. How could that be the case?

Easily, because the useless crap starts to pay for itself instantly whereas the donations to a charity may never benefit you ever at all. The question becomes how can we have useful and meaningful things occur when each person's donation to the whole is so small as to be barely recognizable?

Interestingly enough money is only one part of the equation. A lot of movies are made for 100 millions of dollars and no one watches them and if they did watch them, they actually sucked. So having money is one part of the equation, having a good message but sticky that matters that pays them benefits from following it, that's the other half. Lots of money in with a shitty message that no one cares about or is false or harmful or whatever. You should get fucked and it should be burned money, but a great idea that no one ever hears about well that isn't good either.

R503 & QW.503

Marketing as pollution

Save your self-lots of time by not reading news stories, especially news stories that trigger Bertram's law, "could, might, maybe, is this?, etc., it's going to be a shit filler story, because if it had more meat, they'd lead with the meat. Fuck all those stories.

Clickbait analysis marketing pollution

Fuck, so you get exponentially more shares with increasing list size. Most clickbait shit I've ever seen?

More at:

http://sfglobe.com/?id=18058&src=home_feed

<http://minimaxir.com/2015/01/linkbait/>

Education

Intro

How many good men and women are wasting their lives away? How many people are sitting doing manual labor that a machine should be doing? Is this the meaning of life? To go to school so you can come the worlds shittiest version of google, spitting out half right and half wrong facts when queried? Can we please stop pretending that it is the mission of

our education system to make automatons? Or is it actually. I guess the system was created during the industrial revolution? And hasn't changed much since.

Learning useless shit

We have limited time in this world, and every minute we spend learning the wrong thing, is a minute not spent learning the right thing. What are the right things? Well, if you were to survey all of the people that have ever been through an education system, and superhumanly discover all of the things they learned that they not only never used, but forgot, or misremembered or misunderstood to the point of being dangerous, average all that stuff out and stop teaching it. Stop wasting everyone's fucking time please. There are things in this world that aren't useful. Every fucking snowflake isn't special. Sometimes you need to take all the snowflakes and shovel them off your window so you can see the road.

If you want to spend some time picking out useless garbage that is taught commonly in schools all around the planet, it's really, really easy to do. Sadly. Is our children's time not valuable? Have they mastered so many great ideas and skills that we have the free time to force them to learn useless trivia? Our education system should be entirely revamped. If you learn something, such as the order of the planets from the sun, and their names, yet 10 years after you learn it, say, you can't remember barely their order and perhaps their names. Of what use was it to learn them so specifically in the first place.

It's unlikely that you will need to be making a left turn at mars on your way to get groceries in your space ship anytime soon. And as such I find it roughly impossible to derived any value from knowing their order in the solar system compared to my own. Really, even knowing their order, if it were important somehow, shouldn't we know their distances as well / I mean if this piece of information as worth learning, might we do it at least the right way?

If you're finding speed reading useful to you, you're probably reading the wrong stuff.

R341

The list of useless and or never used chunks of information you are forced to learn in traditional education systems is absurd. I believe that if you replace useless knowledge with useful knowledge it would be of great benefit to not only those doing the learning, but those doing the teaching as well.

List of great things that should be taught instead of list of crap currently taught perhaps title the chapter "School.. let's learn all the wrong things."

It's funny when you feel bad about learning so many trivial things because you can't use them in your life and then you find out that maybe, the thing that makes you most unique is that you know so much trivial shit, but you've tried to make it useful and therefore if you change into the education business; help and educate and change all the other people's lives, you can actually use that shit that you cannot.

R339

The Republic they suggest that there's three classes of people in the society, and then they educate those classes differently, and then they assign standard timeframes to those education periods. Why on Earth would you treat all your students on the same time frame? That's quite stupid. There's some people that are ready to be professors at the age of eighteen. There's some people, most, that will never ever be ready to be professors. How tragic would it be to use some artificial timing that has nothing to do with the student, and nothing to do with the update of science, and nothing to do with the update of education tactic. Right?

Literally in this book, The Republic, they suggested that of the three classes, the guardian class, those people were going to do physical training so that they would get sick less. They believed that being physically fit made you less sick. Well, it doesn't work that way. It actually works the opposite of that. The more training that you do, the more likely you are to become injured. As soon as you get injured, now you're frail. Frail leads to death. Frail leads to problems.

R283

The failure of the Education system- This whole section is also in Mind

Kids know their time is being wasted with useless knowledge

Kids know you're wasting your time; they know they're never going to use this shit. If you're too stupid to come up with an example that's compelling to them when they would use it, then you're dumber than they are because you don't realize that you're wasting their time. For fuck's sake! Stop wasting everyone's time. There's enough to learn in this world that's actually useful to learn, teach them that. If you have an hour of math, an hour of history, an hour of home-ed, where's your hour of motivation?

Where's your hour of visualizing the future? Where's your hour of finding something to care about? Where's your hour of planning and dreaming something that spices you up? Where's your hour of the amplifier and multiplier? The only weak link in the chain that will make any of those other six or seven hours of school worth a shit. Teaching people things they will never use or teaching people things that they could use if they cared, is only as useful as the caring. No caring, no using. You're amplifying the strong part of the chain not the weak part. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link.

R429

We have a motivation problem and they don't teach that in schools

We do not have a knowledge problem. We do not have a fucking education problem. We have a desire, and will, and motivation, and discipline problem. It needs to become a class and it needs to have a curriculum and it needs to be taught, people need to get degrees in it. You should be able to meet someone not having to go through some esoteric business training class, not having to go through some religious experience.

Liberal Arts Degrees and Education system

Everyone gets these liberal arts degrees and goes to a liberal arts college, and no one knows what liberal arts means. I thought I knew, because, you know, I went to college for a while, and I was around people that went to colleges, and I thought that it was like applying butter to a piece of bread. You know, I liberally apply butter to bread because it tastes good. It turns out that in reality, the liberal arts, the word liberal means free. They made it a long time ago, say 2,300 years ago, 2,400 years ago, about 300-400 BC, they decided that the trades, such as building and farming and commerce, like shop keeping, things like that, were for idiots.

Those were the lowest things you could learn. That a free man, that had his own freedom and wasn't a slave, should learn the awesome things and then they categorized those seven awesome things into a set of three and a set of four. The set of three, the trivium, those – believe it or not, that's the root of the word trivia – they didn't even like these three things. You might understand it as reading, writing, and arithmetic. They understood it as grammar, which is getting data in, logic, which is manipulating the data, and rhetoric, which is speaking the data and getting the data back out.

They didn't even look up to that, that badass input-processing-output system, they

didn't even like that. That was, you know, where you started, and where you were to end up was the four things that they actually liked. Now mind you, I just told you three of the seven things that are considered the liberal arts. These next four, when I tell them to you you'll have a complete understanding of what the liberal arts are. Notice that they're not building, they're not engineering, they're not business, they're not medicine, they're not the things that are the most useful things in the whole world. But they think that they're the most important.

Multiple choice tests should be destroyed. No more accidental success.

The entire education system was designed a thousand years ago

So the entire education system is designed around a decision that was made a couple thousand years ago, that was wrong, okay? The world that we live in today is not very similar to the world that we lived in then. Business, and medicine, and basically the things that people look down upon now, those are the important things. And the things that they thought were important, like philosophy, eh. We've kind of got most of that stuff figured out. We don't really need more people in that area. If you don't think that we've made diminishing returns in the philosophy area, there's 200,000 people a day dying right now. What percentage of those people are dying from lack of philosophy? They're dying because their bodies are rotting and falling apart, okay? That's 200,000 people a day, and one day soon, you will be one of those people.

If you don't want to be a rotting piece of meat, a walking corpse, a short, less than a blink of an eye geologically, then you should be focused on shit that gets you to stick around a little bit longer. If you find yourself following the suggestions of thousands of years old, dead people, who optimized for a world that they lived in, that is not very similar to the world that you live in, you are fucking up. If you're taking liberal arts and you don't understand that the choices, the false choices, the artificially restricted choices that you get to choose from in regards to your curriculum exist because some wrong person, some idiot, that has decided that music and philosophy are anywhere near as important as engineering and medicine, that was what they decided to call the free arts, the liberal arts.

Here's the points to summarize. I understand what the liberal arts are. It's a judgement call. It's an artificial restriction of your choices that you think you're getting a wide, balanced, well-rounded education, when in reality you're being crippled, being taught the least valuable information that you can learn, being taught things that you will find the least useful possible. We've had all types of bubbles in this world. We've had bubbles in housing, we've had bubbles in stock markets, and now there's a bubble in the education system.

And bubbles, unfortunately, human beings psychologically don't react well to them. We're very okay with increases in pay, we're very okay with increases in quality of life, we're very not okay with decreases in pay and decreases in quality of life. It's called the Keynesian ratcheting effect in economics. Just like a ratchet, turns really easily one way, doesn't turn so easily the other way. When you have a bubble in education because people have forgotten why education exists, education is not supposed to be babysitting in the collegiate level. Education is not supposed to be learning for learning's sake, and if it ever was, fuck those people. That was a bad decision, a bad design. There's a better way to live. I believe in utility. I believe in Scivival.

This is what I feel liberal arts education and much of what the education that exists in this world is, it's learning the names of things and learning that they exist, and never deriving useful value, or getting any type of actual benefit from that learning. Learning to learn, for learning's sake, so that you can say that you did and take a regurgitated test where you puke facts back on the paper the same way that you received the facts in the first place, and then rapidly forget that crap because you never ever use it again in the real world, what could be worse? What could be worse than convincing someone that to be a good person in a society, and to be useful in a society, they need to learn things that don't matter and understand them in a way that's not useful, only to forget them again shortly soon when their life and their consciousness and the supporting of their family and the obtainment of their goals revolves around all of the things that you excluded from their education?

Personal finance, personal presentation. How to be a good friend. How to be fair to yourself. What does being fair to yourself look like? What does being fair to your friends look like? What does being too easy on others look like? What does losing friends because you didn't get things signed in writing and then now their own subconscious works against them and they misremember the past, because it's financially profitable for them to misremember the past? It's easy to misremember the past.

If you still think the liberal arts are there to teach you how to learn, you misunderstand why they are there. There is a study of how people learn, there is the ability to major in education, there is the study of where knowledge comes from, there's a fancy word for it. If you want to learn what is knowable and how we know what is knowable, and perhaps the best ways to learn things, well if you think learning things is memorizing things, well then you should study memory, and that should be a course. And people who compete in memory competitions, that should be a course. But I wouldn't be surprised if the liberal arts removed that from the ability of the course selection guide, because it's too goddam useful. And we need things that are less useful, so that we turn people into losers. They don't understand they're losers, because we use proof by complexity.

R283

If I can get you better results for yourself in a shorter time frame than college does, is not the education you get with me worth more money? Specifically since it is saving you more of your time.

R455

If you didn't take ethics and how to be a good friend and how to be a good friend and how to manage your personal finances, and how to stick up for yourself and how to be fair to yourself, which everyone knows in the entire world that those things are vitally important. If you learned the order of the planets from the sun instead of those things, you fucked up. You spent your time the wrong way. You are less effective and you were less of a good person and a less powerful being now because you deprived yourself, maybe by accident, maybe through ignorance, you didn't know you could learn those things.

If you think liberal arts is to teach you how to learn, that's called epistemology, and you can go into that and try and go into education and the study of learning

as a thing. But when they're teaching you music, they're not teaching you how to learn. When they're teaching you writing, they're not teaching you how to use your memory. They're different goddam things. So don't fall for the hype, don't fall for the bullshit. If you want to create super learners, I guarantee you that your things that you study won't look anything like the curriculums that are out there now.

We've gone far and wide. In summary: if you think the liberal arts are giving you a clear, unbiased option of learning from all of the things that are learnable, you are widely, widely far from the mark. You're totally wrong. In colleges, you get to choose from a course list. That course list is taught by humans. Those humans teach what they feel they're capable of teaching, and often times with a hell of a lot of guidelines. I don't think that you could find a more restrictive, less choice-based, less varied, less structured way to learn a thing on the whole planet. It's the most organized, the least adventurous, the least varied.

R284

There's the least number of options available to you. That's the opposite of a wide-ranging education. A wide-ranging education would be, you open an encyclopedia or an atlas and you point to a page, and that's what you're learning. There you go. You have available to you all the things. Having available to you to learn all the things, that's actually a wide-ranging education. That's actually how you might find a passion that other people haven't that you can profit from. That's how you can find an excellence; by diving deeper into an area than other people have.

R284

The education system revolves around you not getting to learn a new thing until you learn the last thing. And if you didn't learn the last thing you don't get to learn the next thing, they keep you in that class again and again and again and then and only then when they think you'll benefit from a harder class that builds on the last class do you earn the opportunity to learn that new thing. If all the knowledge is free then why the fuck would you pay for an education. If the knowledge is free what are you paying for? To waste your time and your money?

R293

How do you tell who is smart?

If you want people to learn, there are things that the learner never uses. Then you can make an actual study guide that you expect them to finish that you can charge for that they can actually use. If I tell you. Hey! Go on Ali Baba buy something you like stock it at home sell it you'll get rich, that's one thing. If I tell you we're setting up an account at Ali Baba now. OK now we're logging in OK now we're looking at the best sellers. Now we're going and we're looking in the retail market we're seeing what they sell for OK there's enough profit.

Now we're going to place an order and we're going to have it shipped this way to your house. And then we're going to put an ad out. It's going to have your phone number and it you're actually going to answer it. Walking you through the steps and actually getting you to do them and holding you to a higher standard is more valuable to you than just knowing a thing exists. Knowing that sales exist is nothing compared to being able to sell. Knowing that dancing exists

is nothing compared to being able to dance.

Getting the freemium content out there that there is a thing that can be done well and here are some ways to do it well I would tell you more but I don't have time. And then getting him into your paid program where because they've paid they'll actually follow through and you discover that if people don't pay. They don't follow through. Like look at the completion rate for massive online courses versus normal courses. It's like four times higher for a normal course. Why? Because people paid for it, they see loss they feel sense of loss and so if you're in the education business, you should have paid content. You should have free content. You probably should even change the price of your content. Like drug companies do. Based on who's buying it.

R329

They charge you money to do it, they take all of your time to do it, and it was all based on a thousands, multiple thousands years ago judgement call as to why these ephemeral, artsy fartsy, hard to iterate on, hard to get feedback on, hard to even choose one way of living over another way of living. We know one way of building beats the shit out of another one, because we can measure it.

R283

Isn't it a little odd that all of the things that businesses and professionals pay thousands upon thousands to go to boot camps to learn could be easily taught in school like scheduling, goal setting, positive feedback and loops.

R346

Imagine someone's flabby arm, and they're having a conversation with it, looking at it and say to it, "I don't understand this flabby arm. I want it to be stronger." And I tell it about all the different ways that you can get stronger, and about eating protein, and about doing curls, and doing chin-ups, and doing pull-ups, and all the things that would help it grow. It just sits there and it just doesn't do anything. No matter how many different things I tell it, it never gets stronger. So, dear Internet, why doesn't talking to my muscle make it stronger? And that you see, is the reason that education doesn't work. We don't need more people to be told things. We need the people to do things.

R431

The common education system teaches what you don't need to know. Apprenticeship is practical Education is basically "let's teach you everything you don't need to know, here's stuff you definitely don't need to know to do anything useful for yourself or anyone else" let's spend a lot of time on that. Whereas apprenticeship is like hey, here is something that actually needs to get done, we're providing a service instantly, and we're getting paid for it. Let's actually do the thing, then you get good at something someone actually gives a shit about.

R107

Education, teaching useful stuff

No one teaches you how to pay your taxes, how to not get scammed on eBay how to be a good friend what fashion looks like. How to not to get your ass kicked. Self-defense should be part of school. They also don't teach you how streets works avenues boulevards, the highway system, how you can use that for direction, maybe they should tell you how to figure out where north is.

R52

Education system is broken and is a performance stealing insurance policy

I guess the education system is broken for the same reason that not building a minimal viable product is broken. You're basically paying a lot of real money to buy insurance that

you MIGHT need to know something or that you MIGHT need to have a feature, and you pay for that insurance with real time not knowing something that you do need to know, or not being able to fund your survival until you do get market traction. So basically the education system is a very expensive insurance policy that costs you real world performance and just learning what you need to know and being very, very good at that at the ignorance of all the shit you don't need to know. It's just like extinction level events, it only pays if 1. You actually care whether the world exists or not. And if you don't get to participate in it. Which is an existential question I guess and 2. Yeah there is no 2. it's just insurance if some extinction shit doesn't happen than you just wasted your time, but if some extinction shit DOES happen then well...?

R54

Solar system

Do you remember earth is in a solar system around our sun. Do you remember how many planets are in our solar system? Do you remember their order from the sun? Should you? Do you need to make a left turn at mars in your space ship, and you're afraid you'll miss your turn?

State Capitals

Do you remember the capitals of all the states in the United States? Have you had to go or send anything ever to even 10 percent of those places in your entire life? Hell, functionally what even is the use of this "capital" ? When you think Florida, do you think Tallahassee Population almost 200k , or Miami population 400k+? The population stats are a little misleading, take a look at this: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Miami_metropolitan_area about 6million people vs https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tallahassee_metropolitan_area at about 400k.

Why are we teaching the kids to memorize Tallahassee instead of Miami? Why would we prioritize this "state capital" status, over the GDP, or available jobs, or growth, or any possible metric that a young human might actually care about , and instead teaching this literally trivial crap, in that you may only care about it if it shows up in a trivia game. Imagine if I set the bar even lower, and chose the capital of a smaller state, perhaps Montpelier Vermont, with it's roughly 8000 people. If you live in a state capital, I'm sure you say the opposite muscle is tensing up pretty hard right now.

Street preachers

This one is always fun when you meet street preachers. Have you heard about the 10, not 11 and not 9 commandments? Did you ever hear what they were. Give the next street preacher or religious person a little quiz and ask them what the ten commandments are. I've never had anyone actually get more than 8 of them. You have to ask them, if god cared about these 10 things to make them his exclusive list of commandments, and you're out here trying to influence and through influence control the world. Perhaps you should revisit your knowledgebase and learn what the fuck it is you're trying to teach. Mind you, I think the 10 commandments are a pretty terrible way to try and instill ethics in people. Let's take a quick look at them.

First, there aren't 10 of them. What? How can that be? Well, there's 17 statements, in 2 different books, that people have grouped into 10 in different ways, and they argue about it, quite a bit. There's not even actually 10, but you could choose one of the interpretations I guess, and then you could run with that, so let's give it a try:

The education bubble in price, housing bubble, so many bubbles, the paper belt. I mean, I got a fantastic education, a really fantastic education when I was growing up. I went to community college after, and I quit very shortly after that, because they were trying to teach me things again that I already learned well the first time in high school. As soon as I discovered that I was going to be learning the same crap, thought by worse instructors, at

my own cost, and taking my time. It was the easiest decision of my life to quit that crap.

When you spend your time teaching kids about the politics of 100 or 1000 years ago, you do so at the cost of learning about today's politics. If you think you are doing them a favor because somehow they'll be able to learn the in's and outs of events then, and translate them into useful principles to use today, you are just adding a layer of abstraction which confuses the issue. I mean to say, why not distill the things you're supposed to learn functionally from those ancient events, and just tell them straight up that ideals application in the recent past and near future. Without the abstraction.

If you need to reference the past for proof of an idea's validity, I understand, however if you just want to learn that the minute men existed, and xyz other thing existed, you're doing so at the cost of them being easily manipulated by the spin doctors and pundits of the day. George Washington will not save you from the spin room. In case you didn't hear about spin rooms, basically all good politicians become good at taking the same data or same event, and putting their "spin" on it, or frame around it, to make it look how it would maximally benefit them, sometimes regardless of the obvious fakeness of it. You should see how some politicians dodge the use of a term like "global warming" as though their heads would immediately implode if the world left their mouth.

I think "spin" stuck as a great word to describe the practice of misdescribing things, like tilting a pinball machine while you are playing it, because what you're spinning doesn't change, it stays constant, how you make it travel in the world does change when you spin it though, so like framing and spinning, the thing that you're manipulating stays the same, however the stuff you do to it and put around it changes. It's nice when a simple descriptive word like that makes so clear what is really going on. It makes it easier to see through the bullshit.

George Carlin had a great bit on how language has been continually manipulated and molested to the point where the words used now barely have the meanings they need to have to be maximally useful for us.

Here's that bit:

I don't like words that hide the truth. I don't like words that conceal reality. I don't like euphemisms, or euphemistic language. American English is loaded with euphemisms. Cause Americans have a lot of trouble dealing with reality. Americans have trouble facing the truth, so they invent the kind of a soft language to protect themselves from it, and it gets worse with every generation. For some reason, it just keeps getting worse. I'll give you an example of that. There's a condition in combat. Most people know about it. It's when a fighting person's nervous system has been stressed to its absolute peak and maximum. Can't take any more input. The nervous system has either (click) snapped or is about to snap. In the first world war, that condition was called shell shock. Simple, honest, direct language.

Two syllables, shell shock. Almost sounds like the guns themselves. That was seventy years ago. Then a whole generation went by and the second world war came along and very same combat condition was called battle fatigue. Four syllables now. Takes a little longer to say. Doesn't seem to hurt as much. Fatigue is a nicer word than shock. Shell shock! Battle fatigue. Then we had the war in Korea, 1950. Madison avenue was riding high by that time, and the very same combat condition was called operational exhaustion. Hey, were up to eight syllables now! And the humanity has been squeezed completely out of the phrase. It's totally sterile now. Operational exhaustion. Sounds like something that might happen to your car. Then of course, came the war in Viet Nam, which has only been over for about sixteen or seventeen years, and thanks to the lies and deceptions surrounding that war, I guess it's no surprise that the very same condition was called post-traumatic stress disorder. Still

eight syllables, but we've added a hyphen! And the pain is completely buried under jargon. Post-traumatic stress disorder. I'll bet you if we'd of still been calling it shell shock, some of those Viet Nam veterans might have gotten the attention they needed at the time. I'll betcha. I'll betcha.

But. But, it didn't happen, and one of the reasons. One of the reasons is because we were using that soft language. That language that takes the life out of life. And it is a function of time. It does keep getting worse. I'll give you another example. Sometime during my life. Sometime during my life, toilet paper became bathroom tissue. I wasn't notified of this. No one asked me if I agreed with it. It just happened. Toilet paper became bathroom tissue. Sneakers became running shoes. False teeth became dental appliances. Medicine became medication. Information became directory assistance. The dump became the landfill. Car crashes became automobile accidents. Partly cloudy became partly sunny. Motels became motor lodges. House trailers became mobile homes. Used cars became previously owned transportation. Room service became guest-room dining.

Constipation became occasional irregularity. When I was a little kid, if I got sick they wanted me to go to the hospital and see a doctor. They want me to go to a health maintenance organization or a wellness center to consult a healthcare delivery professional. Poor people used to live in slums. The economically disadvantaged occupy substandard housing in the inner cities. And they're broke! They're broke! They don't have a negative cash-flow position. They're fucking broke! Cause a lot of them were fired. You know, fired. management wanted to curtail redundancies in the human resources area, so many people are no longer viable members of the workforce.

Smug, greedy, well-fed white people have invented a language to conceal their sins. It's as simple as that. The CIA doesn't kill anybody anymore, they neutralize people or they depopulate the area. The government doesn't lie, it engages in disinformation. The pentagon actually measures nuclear radiation in something they call sunshine units. Israeli murderers are called commandos. Arab commandos are called terrorists. Contra killers are called freedom fighters. Well, if crime fighters fight crime and fire fighters fight fire, what do freedom fighters fight? They never mention that part of it to us, do they? Never mention that part of it.

Some of this stuff is just silly, we all know that, like on the airlines, they say want to pre-board. Well, what the hell is pre-board, what does that mean? To get on before you get on? They say they're going to pre-board those passengers in need of special assistance. Cripples! Simple honest direct language. There is no shame attached to the word cripple that I can find in any dictionary. No shame attached to it, in fact it's a word used in bible translations. Jesus healed the cripples. Doesn't take seven words to describe that condition. But we don't have any cripples in this country anymore. We have The physically challenged. Is that a grotesque enough evasion for you? How about differently abled. I've heard them called that. Differently abled! You can't even call these people handicapped anymore. They'll say, "Were not handicapped. Were handicapable!" These poor people have been bullshitted by the system into believing that if you change the name of the condition, somehow you'll change the condition. Well, hey cousin, pst. Doesn't happen. Doesn't happen.

We have no more deaf people in this country, hearing impaired. No-one's blind anymore, partially sighted or visually impaired. We have no more stupid people. Everyone has a learning disorder or he's minimally exceptional. How would you like to be told that about your child? "He's minimally exceptional." "Oohh, thank god for that." Psychologists actually have started calling ugly people, those with severe appearance deficits. It's getting so bad, that any day now I expect to hear a rape victim referred to as an unwilling sperm recipient.

We have no more old people in this country. No more old people. We shipped them all away, and we brought in these senior citizens. Isn't that a typically American twentieth century phrase? Bloodless, lifeless, no pulse in one of them. A senior citizen. But I've accepted that one, I've come to terms with it. I know it's to stay. We'll never get rid of it. That's what they're going to be called, so I'll relax on that, but the one I do resist. The one I keep resisting is when they look at an old guy and they'll say, "Look at him Dan! He's ninety years young." Imagine the fear of aging that reveals. To not even be able to use the word "old" to describe somebody. To have to use an antonym. And fear of aging is natural. It's universal. Isn't it? We all have that. No one wants to get old. No one wants to die, but we do! So we bullshit ourselves. I started bullshitting myself when I got to my forties. As soon as I got into my forties I'd look in the mirror and I'd say, "well, I guess I'm getting older." Older sounds a little better than old doesn't it? Sounds like it might even last a little longer. Bullshit, I'm getting old! And it's okay, because thanks to our fear of death in this country, I won't have to die I'll pass away. Or I'll expire like a magazine subscription. If it happens in the hospital, they'll call it a terminal episode. The insurance company will refer to it as negative patient-care outcome. And if it's the result of malpractice, they'll say it was a therapeutic misadventure. I'm telling you, some of this language makes me want to vomit. Well, maybe not vomit. Makes me want to engage in an involuntary personal protein spill. From <<http://www.iceboxman.com/carlin/pael.php#track15>>

Isn't it funny

Isn't it funny how any women in the history of women when asked why they work out, responds "it's for me". I mean you would think just by random chance that somewhere in this entire planet there would be a single singing woman who worked out, because she wanted to get a hot boyfriend for summer, or because there was a real competition going on in the world for television parts and good men. Nope. It's always just for them. Pretty disingenuous or not self-aware if you ask me.

Useful art

The useful arts shit on the "fine" arts https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Useful_art the vulgar arts: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Artes_Mechanicae are more useful than the liberal arts: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal_arts_education

Class War (xx much of this should go in money)

How broke

Half of Americans Can't Raise \$2K in 30 Days

A quarter wouldn't be able to come up with \$2,000 at all, and another 19% would have to pawn or sell some of their possessions to do so.

From <<http://business.time.com/2011/06/01/nearly-half-of-americans-would-struggle-to-come-up-with-2k-in-30-days/>>

Percentage of millionaires walking on the street day to day. 1 in 20 New York. 1 in 3 Monaco

<http://www.businessinsider.com/one-out-of-every-21-new-yorkers-is-a-millionaire-2014-7?IR=T>

How little money Americans really have

http://www.reddit.com/r/personalfinance/comments/32tn07/over_50_of_americans_have_less_than_10k_in/

Class War

Gratitude that they're on the amazing end of the stick, that they might not realize they are. The concept that there's a war between classes, that shit is not fantasy, that shit is real. If you grew up in the wrong neighborhood, you can shoot yourself right in the head because there's no-one coming to help your ass. I got mad lucky when I was growing up, that I was born smart and got to go to some of the better schools, it didn't need to go that way, I could've turned out like everyone else in my neighborhood. I fully support the concept of

that existing, I think maybe you excluded that because you couldn't fit it into the...?

SC2.7

Only the quality time gets counted towards your quantity.

If it is true that quantity of life is important, what good is a life slaving for a master? If you think that quantity of life is important, then you surely can't assign the same value to the hours flipping burgers as the hours you spend with your friends and family. One of these hours is worth a lot more than the other, if you're going to make the blanket statement that quality of life is important and quantity of life is important I would make the statement that doing less of those things which are the shittiest part of life like cleaning clogged toilets, or cleaning up the shit art that people perform in the toilet areas magically, like they brought a shit paintbrush with them or something. Not doing those things is a super important part of life, we want to do less of those things and the only way to do that is to get out of that class, there's no other escape.

SC2.8

The magic of property and its ownership.

Content?

The capital class

if you don't have your money owning productive things, you will never become wealthy
wealth is not power, like knowing about lifting weights isn't lifting weights.

Change is changing

There are massive life changing world changing things going on in the world right now. There was a time in this world where your value to society was in what you could do. That time is basically gone. Your value to the world now is what you own, and it's about to get much, much worse. Let's take a look at self-driving cars. If you take a look at what jobs everyone works in the united states, and look at the number of jobs per a slot, you will see that the top slot that employees the largest amount of people is transportation. Now why does this suck.

<http://imgur.com/xSGleWv>

Self driving cars

The logic that is required for a car to drive itself is less than the power already in your cellular phone. The only thing that's been missing are the sensors to tell the phone what's going on, and the software in the phone, and when the phone decides that it wants the car to do something, the car needs to be able to respond.

Some things in the care that currently don't respond to electrical signals like steering, breaking, and depending on the age of the car, acceleration. Long story short, that's what's coming down the pike. About 3 million people are going to be jobless within 10 to 15 years. If I had my druthers I'd add lots and lots more people to that list. As soon as the machines can do our jobs better than us, let them do it.

This is a kind of great future. On one hand we have lot and lots of people who are free to live their lives without taking tons of risks driving all over the place, and doing crappy jobs away from their families, learning nothing with no learning on the job, no progress. Only one downside. They are broke, they have no job, and they might even be unemployable.

Everyone thinks that the 2 places lots of people are going to make progress and money in the next 15 years are bitcoin, and where data meets biology, and biohacking.

What do we do with all the unemployed people? Sounds nice to phrase it like that, like when your grandpa is sitting at the table and you're talking about him in the third person like he's not really sitting there. A non-entity. That's a pretty crappy way to be treated. Being unemployed kind of feels like that. It takes training and some mind trickery to be able to deal with rejection on a regular basis. You have to keep your eye on the price and learn to

revel in the rejection, to enjoy it, to see it as part of the process. Or you could just hate it and have a really hard time. Better to enjoy the process if at all possible.

Class war

The richest people in the world have the most control of the laws that get passed and the laws that get enforced. The people that are in the law making class, and in the ruling class, are also often of a higher financial group as well, and therefore when they pass specific tax breaks for their friends, their buddies, the people that put them in office, they also get to receive the benefits from those tax breaks. One thing that you see across the world is that people that are so rich that they don't have to work anymore get to own a lot of assets. The assets work for them. Whatever money is generated from the assets that they're lucky enough to own, they only pay tax at half the rate a normal human gets paid. Let's say in two thousand and let's call it two thousand and two in America.

The highest tax rate for personal income was thirty five percent. The highest tax rate for capital gains tax was fifteen percent. That means that if you bust your ass and work really, really hard at a job, or a personally owned business, and you make a million dollars, you have to give three hundred and fifty thousand of that to the government that year. Right? Or within some short time frame after the close of the year. If however you didn't do any fucking work at all, and you shoved your thumb up your lazy ass, and instead let, what is not you, what you own do the work, well then you'll only give the government a hundred and fifty grand. So, if you own stock in a giant megacorporation, and the giant Megacorp pays you a dividend of a million dollars, you're only taxed at a hundred and fifty thousand. And actually, you can become a Puerto Rican citizen, and that dividend will be taxed at zero.

Puerto Rico's part of America. You can move to the U.S. Virgin Islands or to Puerto Rico, and reduce your capital gains taxable rate to zero. You might even be able to do that on some of your normal income, but it's definitely going to be a higher rate. The question then becomes, why is it that you have two Americans, both of their net worth's have increased by a million dollars. One of them cuts the government a check for three hundred and fifty thousand, and the other cuts the government a check for like a hundred and twenty five. How is that fair, that the richer person that performs less work and benefits society less due to their own personal fuckin' laziness, why does that person pay half the fucking tax rate, is the guy that broke his ass? Why?

Because the assholes in charge of the system want it that way. That is how the rich get richer, because the rich don't get paid based on what they do; the rich get paid based on what they own. In this world, if you want a ton of power, and a ton of options, and for the control of other peoples' lives, what they say, how they dress, where they move, when they sleep, you own the company that owns their time. What you do with your time, personally, will be rewarded at least twenty five percent less, well, as what the stuff you own is rewarded by. Why?

Because it's taxed less. Oh, and guess what? That getting taxed less? It doesn't just fuck you in the first year. It fucks you for the rest of time, because it's tax deferral. Not only- Let's say that your company that you own stock in wanted to give you a million dollars in dividends, but instead you convince them to just not give you the dividend, and to just reinvest it back in the company. Now, you didn't pay any tax taking the money out. Now you've got more money at work, generating you even more money, which will be taxed even less, and you never pay the tax. You just keep moving it and deferring it and do light-kind exchanges until one day, you get a loan against the money that you could take out if you wanted to.

You still don't pay any tax! You never pay any fuckin' tax! But the guy that has to work for a living, that poor son of a bitch, he has to pay tax immediately. Now, at a double rate to you.

Why? 'Cause the world's not fucking far, and because there is class war, and the rich fuck the poor whenever it is convenient. The only time the rich don't fuck the poor is when they can actually richer out of not fucking the poor, which, thank goodness, is pretty often.

R616

World has changed

At what point do we come to realize that the world has changed massively, and that our education systems should look pretty massively different as well. Great news, I've got some great ideas on how to make that whole situation better. First, why is there no experimentation going on?

How different the world is going to look when cars drive themselves, airplanes and cars are electric, and there's a lot less reason for you to be driving in to work. The massive losses with commuting, a guaranteed income in a world where working is optional. The bad side effect of capitalism, where the rich really do keep getting richer, up to a breaking point. The concepts of ownership that served us well on the way to where we are, are probably not going to serve us the best going forward. What would the right state of mind be in regards to ownership. Copyism and digital rights.

Robots

In a world where more and more machines are going to be able to do more and more people's jobs better than they could ever hope to do them it is those that can afford to buy a machine that will become wealthy, and everyone else, well unless you live in Scandinavia, you're pretty much fucked, because you will be unemployable. The rich are getting richer faster than the poor are. The gap is widening.

I think there is a good precedence for these types of change occurring in the past, for instance when the thread weaving thingy was invented. Lots and lots of people used to be...?

You should check out this amazing television series that aired in the 80's called Connections by James Burke. You would be very amazed at the ways that the world has truly progressed on the backs of other unrelated inventions. Even how many things have been invented by mistake. When you look at the world and its progress as a way that we all grow from others growth, then you look to population increases to increase the rate of amplification of others discoveries. I like more people, not less.

This whole time I've been looking at the catholic church as evil because of their no condom policy, how funny would it be that because of that police and the likely population increases that it is responsible for in the world, that we actually end up better off 25 years from now, after a perhaps 15 year period of suckage, because we are able to figure out how to educated and feed everyone (and house), and the extra humans are around to be able to take advantage of that because they're' 24 years old now, because 24 years ago the catholic church was preaching stupid, yet population increasing ideas.

We can look at these examples of peak horse population in say 1921, or 8 track players, or vacuum tubes, or any way that you used to do to get things done, that you now use a different way, how many abacus's are used, how many type writers, how many wheel barrows > interesting story, apparently the wheel barrow in china beats the crap out of the European wheel barrow, but for some reason the European one is still popular in America and Europe, I guess Jerry Seinfeld aid it best in regards to some persistent ideas, like chop sticks, the fork is around, but they're sticking with it.

Anyway the moral of the story is, nearly every technological advancement, is called an advancement, and not a change, because it's better for the world. If you think that screwing

up the technical advances of the planet, so you can keep your job is the right way to do things, fuck you.

Back to the technology change thing, used to take lots of people to bleach clothes, then someone invented bleach. Learned that in the good ole connections series. Thus, there are some jobs that are going to be the last to go, those people will do the things that the computers and machines and robots find hardest to do. Everyone knows it's coming, it's inevitable, 100 years ago, they thought it would come faster than it did. In the 1950's they thought the year 2000 would be an amazing year. Shiny clothes, flying cars, and robots serving our drinks and cleaning up.

Well, those guys had some great ideas. Turns out, lots of the stuff they thought up is actually really hard to do. Seems like right now the best we've got is a robotic vacuum cleaner. There's a pretty funny set of photos on the internet of what happens when the Roomba meets rather wet dog crap. Lady that Roomba tried to eat while she was sleeping. It is not a pretty sight. Anyway, if you can save up some scratch and buy your own robot replacement or some shares in a company that owns the robot that will replace you, then you have a future. If you can't, you better hope the government comes and saves you.

Printing more money

The unfairness of, ok, let's just print money and double the money that everyone currently has. Millionaire gets 1M dollars. Broke guy gets nothing. How the fuck is that fair? Funny quote, banks are not in the business of lending money to people that need loans. The upside of double or nothing betting again and again taking advantage of the bankruptcy law. Basically in a mathematically balanced world, if you played double or nothing again and again over and over again, you would end up with either a very large profit, or a very large loss, or 0. But because bankruptcy law exists, it cuts off the giant negatives, you can just have the legal system reset you to 0. So in the western world at least, you can take giant risks, privatize the profits for yourself, but kind of socialize the losses, because you can get society to release you of your debt to the people you owe money to. In Arab cultures, or other places with debtors prison or worse, you don't get to have the same limit on downside volatility you get in the western cultures.

Economic betrayal of Gen Y

https://www.reddit.com/r/worldnews/comments/49c7t3/revealed_the_30year_economic_betrayal_dragging/
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/mar/07/revealed-30-year-economic-betrayal-dragging-down-generation-y-income>

Under Crowding

It's funny how sensitive people are to the population density of the planet when quite literally the whole thing used to be so covered in creatures that they created iron and fossil fuels.

R104

Can somebody explain to me how the world has too many people on it, but we're dying of overeating and we have SUVs? Because, doesn't that mean we have too much space and too much food? Yeah, I think someone's doing their math wrong.

R204

I would love the chart on how much hard it is to get successful pregnancy term every year over the age of twenty-five, that number might not be the right one, but something similar for women. Wouldn't mind looking up for dudes either, but I think I did it; and it doesn't really change.

R149

From an evolutionary perspective the richer you get the more resources you have, the safer and

more often you're supposed to have kids. These days rich people tend to fail hard in the eyes of evolution. It turns out these days that poor people produce more offspring than the rich. Which kind of means if you are getting rich, your baby making parts work less well (from an evolutionary perspective). Less offspring means the system that made you, thinks you are a bad human. We need more of the right people. Where do the right people often come from? The wrong people, of course.

R92

Under crowding argument is crap

Progress comes from humans. Throw enough shit at the wall, more of it sticks. We need more humans, preferably the useful kind.

Currency

Discount giving based on behavior and currency/value ratios

Why not give people a discount based on some random thing? This random thing could be tied to a certain behavior. We want to support money that doesn't get printed into infinity. If you look at a hundred years ago, the price of silver, milk, eggs, land, bread, gas, they all maintained the same ratio. If you want to buy eggs or silver, the ratio is the same. But the dollar is worth ten times less, a hundred times less. Not a hundred times less, I think. What the change? Well, the dollar changed. And for this equation, all those things still have the same value they've always had, except the dollar. The dollar's fucking valueless.

SC1.103

Currency and inflation

Well, why? Because they keep printing it. No one needs yours. Why would I need your dollar when I could go and just get a fresh, brand new one right from the fed? I don't need your fucking dollars. Glad you're working so hard to save them. Enjoy your net loss every year. You ain't beating inflation. What's inflation? That's when we print money to steal from savers. "Oh, you save money? Fuck you." You just lost money. Sitting in cash is like almost the worst thing you could do over any long period of time, because it's guaranteed to become valueless. Like, that is the thing that will go to nothing.

SC1.104

https://www.reddit.com/r/OldSchoolCool/comments/2y51dj/mcdonalds_menu_during_1973/

Reciprocity & Scarcity

What makes gold valuable is the fact that human beings believe in reciprocity. You could walk up to a human and give him gold, look at him and expect food in return, but he could look at you and just be like I'm not giving you my shit, I don't care that you just gave me something. The funny thing about analyzing about whether something makes a good store of value or what not is that they skipped the psychological things that make it even work which is the ability to communicate the ability to detect other human beings at all through our senses.

The emotional programming of those people to reciprocate because it's been selected for because it's an advantageous strategy in the world we live in, and because of that you could do well if you are designing a new currency, tie it to emotions as much as possible and stop trying to emulate those things that worked on the meta layer on top of the emotions like gold. Like scarcity. Scarcity only works because we were programmed to value it, we could have easily valued things that are not scarce, it just would have worked less well, because we would have not eaten some things that we needed to eat.

R34

What really is money

It never was trading chickens for cows, it was always a mental and then written or tokenized ledger. One example I have is this report on what really is money Mitchell Innes. From The Banking Law Journal, May 1913. By A. Mitchell Innes. The fundamental theories on which

the modern science of political economy is based are these:

<http://www.gobankingrates.com/savings-account/62-percent-americans-under-1000-savings-survey-finds/>

Winning the inheritance lottery

Ruins lives, your kids also kind of wish you were dead.

Deflation

Is deflation actually bad, and if so how could we stop it from being bad without stealing from savers?

BTC

Economics. Supply & Demand

R83. In a properly working economy as prices increase it invites competition and increased supply, which brings the price down. It's kind of a cool self-balancing thing. It's part of the reason capitalist economies work so well is flexible pricing and flexible production. When you artificially limit the size of blocks allowed in the block chain what you're actually doing is limiting the amount of people that can actually participate, and so if you create a "fee" market which increases the cost of putting things in the chain you're not inviting extra supply, you're not taking advantage of fees in order to making the world a better place by allowing more people to participate, you're just changing it so that the only people that can afford to participate are the economically advantaged, and those that would benefit the most by reduced fees and being banked instead of unbanked will be literally taken off the chain.

Bitcoin problems

Why on earth

Why on earth would the bitcoin block chain use the shittiest slowest most fucked up way of distributing its initial chain when you have to trust the software that you're running, which you could use hash to do. Why don't you trust the initial giant fucking torrent you download with the same hash bullshit and use bit torrent and it's 10x or 100x faster.

R42

Reason Bitcoin is not working

The reason cryptocurrency isn't working is because no one has a reason to buy it. If you go out and exchange, you pay 5% discount rate to buy your coins, [inaudible 100:02.6] 1% discount from the retailer, you're ending up losing 4%. Why the fuck would you want to lose 4%? Does that make any sense? And you also have the exchangers. There's volatility. You have to pay the [inaudible 100:11.5]. The more you buy, the more the market [inaudible 100:13.3]. Fucking sucks. How can you cancel out this problem of having to pay [inaudible 100:17.6] and having to pay more to get into the market than you do with the savings that you get?

Well, one way would be to make those discounts, like, larger. Well, one way is to reduce [inaudible 100:31.0] by increasing [inaudible 100:32.1]. Another way... yeah, if you buy 100,000 you move the marketing [inaudible 100:41.3] to about 1.8%. Nope. If you go to Bitcoin Wisdom, scroll your mouse to the right hand side, you can go and [inaudible 100:53.5], like it will just - as you mouse over, it'll tell you to buy this many coins, will cost you this, which will cost this percentage moving [inaudible 100:59.2].

SC1.99

Why Bitcoin is Great

Cryptocurrency

If I set my mind on something that I am good at, I am a pickup artist who have done amazing things in different fields. The only reason I mentioned pickup is cryptocurrency. I love this concept; it is a world-changing concept modifying the

relationship between people and government. It changes the state currency, and it is amazing.

SC1.16

Automatically send

You can automatically send Bitcoin from a vanity address to advertise to people that are known to have donated to certain other projects! BTC needs marketing. Needs local heroes to allow vertical chain cycles. No one ever mentions rolling reserves. That 2 percent discount you get is made up in a higher price to you. Stuff matters. Money is a virtualization for it to work properly it needs to represent human tenor work and that means scarcity. We also inherently value scarcity. Money models that are not scarce do not and cannot function as money.

I dare you to try and sell a bitcoin today at the future value of a bitcoin. Go ahead and try to sell a bitcoin today for what you think its future profit will be. Pretend that bitcoin is a business, and it's the fastest appreciating asset class that the world has ever seen, and that its value has been compounding at roughly 100 percent per year or more since it was invented. Then go ahead and try and sell a coin today for its future profit.

The coin has no future profit, it isn't productive on its own, its literally a commodity, it can't and shouldn't be able to be differentiated from all the other bitcoins that it competes with for value. Because of this a bitcoin can only be traded for the value that it has today, not the future value that you think it will have. If you tried to, someone would just buy one of the other coins, not yours, because commodities are traded at today's value, the spot price, not some value in the future.

Now you could say that you could trade your Bitcoin commodity on a government approved commodity trading platform such as the Chicago board of exchange (cboe). In such an environment you may be able to trade the future value of your stuff. You could sell your bitcoins at a date in the future. Now let's look at how much profit you can make selling your future delivery of a Bitcoin. If the market believes that Bitcoins will go down in value instead of up, you will literally make less selling your coins at some date in the future than today. You haven't locked in profit, you've locked in loss. No one is going to pretend that your coins are guaranteed to go up in value, and if you look bitcoins are volatile as fuck, they very often go down in value, whereas businesses are usually profitable, in a bad year they might break even, but rarely do they lose money.

Thus I think it is a rather reasonable statement to make that business outperform speculation, and the only businesses worth fucking with are those that can have hundreds of millions of users, and / or have a strong durable competitive advantage due to critical mass, or difficulty of achievement or cost barrier to entry or other barriers to entry, perhaps even excellent branding.

Basically billion dollar businesses do really come from humble beginnings. How can you decide whether you are better off investing in Bitcoin, or into a business? Good the fuck luck, I have seen people that are successful startup investors take both sides of that bet. I've even seen some of those guys make terrible decisions. I'll give you an example, I've seen a dude invest in a mining company, that obviously enough is out of business now. I mean Bitcoin mining.

Why the fuck would you invest in bitcoin mining when you know the market is already over secured against double spending attack, and that is the only function mining at

scale performs. It's only as useful as an insurance as the likelihood that someone is trying to execute a double spend attack. It is not useful at all towards thwarting other forms of attack which are easily numerable on the Bitcoin wiki. Sibyl attacks, government attacks DDoS's transaction spam, etc. They are all ore viable means of attack than double spending so why should you be spending hundreds of millions to prevent double spend and not even spending a single million on the more common methods of attack that are viable.

The answer is the game theory and the tragedy of the commons. I'm getting so tired of that fucking phrase, the tragedy of the commons, it's becoming boring to me, sadly I'm seeing the principle in so many places, wouldn't it be great if I could come up with another name for it. Perhaps it could be the common suck. Or commsuck. The story goes that if you want to create a new currency, you have to solve a few problems.

Double spending, forgery, divisibility, store of value, unit of account, and original issuance. When you are creating a new currency from scratch, how do you decide how much of it each party gets? It would be fun to take a look at how the EU decides how many euros a person gets when they turn in their old national currency. It's a really, really important answer, because if you fuck the math up, the country that is switching to the euro can get pretty raped. Whatever mechanism they use to arrive at that valuation could perhaps be a similar valuation to how you would issue any new currency.

The problem however lies in that you must destroy the new currency for that kind of math to work. If you are going to use the GDP of a country to decide how much of a new currency they get, then you have to switch them over entirely when you give them the new currency. If there were only partially going to use your new currency, then you would have to give it to them only partially in value to their GDP, for the GDP is all economic outputs of a country. Bitcoin attempts to solve the problem of currency issuance by giving rather massive and unsecure rewards to those that protect the network against double spending.

The fucked up part is, you only get a reward from the network if you prevent double spending attacks. You do not get a reward for promoting the currency, you literally suffer a penalty. The time and or money that you use driving up the value of everyone else's coins, is money that you didn't use to buy more coins yourself. It's comm-fucked. The only reasonable way that I can think of to afford the promotion of the endeavor is to have known stakeholders risk a portion of their current holdings along with others to help increase adoption.

A currency without adoption is a pretty shitty currency. It has been said that the best currency is the currency with the most stability. It has been said that the currency that has the most stability is likely the currency that has the most volume and adoption, that is because if a currency has a lot of liquidity, and participants, then it is very hard for any one participant to massive move the value of the currency. Any attempt to do so, by either selling it or buying it, or borrowing against it, will be offset by the numerous other gigantic entities. A good analogy would be, what would you have to do to try and raise the b of the sea by a inches, a whole lot more than you would to raise the eight of your tub water by a few inches. Because its' so much bigger.

If you want your currency to be the new global reserve currency, and the currency that returns power to the people from the few, and the currency that is censorship resistant, and the currency that doesn't rob savers through inflation, the currency that

become the new language of value transfer between men. Where you no longer need to memorize giant charts of this rate vs that rate, and fees, and middlemen upon middlemen, waking up in Russia one morning to discover your currency is worth half what it was yesterday, and your mortgage is denominated in dollars, you now owe more to the bank than your house will ever be worth in your lifetime, and why? Because of the stupidity of many currencies to represent the things people actually care about. goods and services. There is no compelling reason for the world to have 1 currency for every nation, just as there is no compelling reason to have giant restrictions of movement or capital between countries, more middlemen, more problems. More friction less efficiency.

I think it's pretty fucked the fuck up that I can't make any money promoting bitcoin, because I don't own enough of a stake in bitcoin, to spread my profit out over enough coins to make a return on investment. The percentage of my holdings that I would need to liquidate to afford good marketing would make it so that I would always lose money on every marketing turn, due to the fact that expense would always be higher than the amount of profit per coin left I would need to generate to replace or even add to the coins that I lost.

Is it a solvable problem? Fuck yes. Is anyone trying to solve it? Fuck no. We're the first 5 billion dollar market cap, or m2 currency that has 0 the fuck marketing. What would a viable solution look like. Simple, a crowd funded sale. Here's what it's going to cost to build this thing that needs built, in this case it could be a television commercial, though I think it would make a lot more sense to target the technically savvy.

Technical adept people are usually smarter, and probably less likely to lose their coins.

National security requires cash

I love the countries like Sweden and Norway that say the stupidest things. For instance, let's get rid of physical currency and use only digital currency. Yeah, that sounds great, until Russia invades you, or just decides to hack you from afar. Then what happens to commerce in your country? It grinds to a halt. You don't get a taxi and you don't get to eat, because you thought you were too good for physical currency that requires no electricity. I wouldn't be surprised if secret government agencies didn't stockpile counterfeit currencies of potential enemies in case destroying faith in a national currency were to be chosen as a method to destabilize your enemy. It is still a hell of a lot harder than shutting down a power grid. It's all fun and games till your well-armed and otherwise unstable and unproductive neighbor wants to go on a power trip. If the GPD of your country is 85% natural resources, there is a very good chance you are missing foresight. Renewable energies are coming to eat your lunch.

Savings

Most people have less than 1000 dollars in the bank. More at:

<http://www.gobankingrates.com/savings-account/62-percent-americans-under-1000-savings-survey-finds/>

Isolate government from currency

Peer to peer value transfer. A proper BTC / Zerocoin might work here. Artificially low interest rates amply miss- and mal-investment causing boom and bust cycles that harm the human psychological ratcheting effect. We prefer slow and always better to fast up and fast down pain.

US Dollar

It needs to have gold and US dollar and gasoline and Big Mac index in there.

Charities

Businesses are better than charities

I think it's funny anytime people decide to give money to charity at the expense of giving it

to a business, because business are just charities that only perform their charitable work when you are willing to enjoy the thing so much that you want that you will pay for it yourself thus funding the charity. All businesses are charities except in order to receive the benefits of the charity which is a good or a service you actually have to support the charity financially with a donation which they call the sale price. I think the belief that charities are somehow better than businesses is a little bit misguided, and I think the vast majority of things that make our lives on this planet good are the result of for profit labor.

I think the vast majority of people that get off their ass and actually do something for the world or themselves are the result of gainful employment. Now without the gainful employment, and without the voting with dollars that is capitalism the amount of waste and fucked-upness and sitting around and stupidity would be damn near immeasurable. I think it's useful to see what charities may be good for, and that is doing things that truly cannot be easily monetized, and so this is the highest and best form of organization that we have been able to find similar to the democratic system. It sucks, doesn't work in theory or in practice BUT it's the best we've got so that's what we do.

Maybe one day there will be a for profit capitalistic type of way to save people, but I have to imagine that whatever charitable reasons people have to give, if you could find a way to monetize it and turn it into a business their activities would be as charitable giving to those businesses instead of charities. I don't know maybe charities are more effective in this world. I've never personally met one that did anything good, maybe if I met one.

Hope leads to charity, charity leads to contempt

Charity robs people of dignity. This causes them to hate you. There is a saying similar to this with biblical origins though I've looked into it and it's rather cluttered, probably better to just execute on my own version, however I'd like to see the biblical context for fun here. For my own reasoning purposes

Better and worse charities

Better and worse charities

Are we worried about kids hacking up some viruses in their basements in 20 years? Well, yeah, you probably should be. Are we worried about why everything else that's ever lived here is permanently extinct? Yeah, I think that's probably worth working on, yeah. Yep, permanent extinction sucks. If you think that donating to a poetry charity is the highest and best use of your funds, it means you're okay with a lot of human suffering and death. You may not realize that because you don't have a very broad world view, but it's a fucking fact. It's not a comfortable fact, but it's a fact.

I think if you're going to measure one charity versus another, or one investment versus another, there are better and worse. Better and worse fucking exist. Here's a question: is it better that someone that would want to fund a poetry charity, leave their money say in a bank, which gives lower income families a better loan interest rates, because their money is sitting in the bank, or is it better that they fund that poetry charity? Maybe there are some people that don't care about all this science, technology crap and they just want to feel good, touchy, artsy kind of stuff, and makes the world a better place anyway. You have to account for a human being's innate desires. There are some great musicians that the world would be much worse without them if they were all scientists and there was no music anymore.

SC1.76

Are charities actually performing?

Who would you be, like how hubristic would you need to be - I don't think I've ever heard anybody use that fucking word. That's weird. I mean, I've never used that word. How, I don't know, conceded would you need to be in order to think that you didn't need to do what he needed to do to get where you wanted the world to be? I think...

[silence 90:01.4 - 91:06.4] Well, my opinion on the [inaudible 91:08.2] angle and this. I don't have the statistical awareness to know the accuracy of the statement, so it's going to be heavily influenced by my peer group.

Nobody else I know gives as much to charity as Bill. I mean fucking nobody. Throughout the whole history of my life. Like, nobody. Nobody's giving shit about anybody. Where I grew up, what's charity? No fucking concept of what charity is, and why would you give to it. I think that if you were to measure the number of people that support charity compared to the number of people that don't, I think you'd find more people that jerked off to Japanese anime porn. I think the people that give to charity are such a small fucking group. That's what it feels like to me. And if that wasn't the case, then I would expect there to be a lot more charitable shit going on.

When you go out in the street and you walk around, how many things do you see that are charities? You see maybe one guy getting some money for [inaudible 92:27.2], and that's it. Or maybe once in a while you'll see a guy ringing a bell for that. Right. And that's it. If there were all these people giving all those money to charity, I would expect there to be some fucking visible effects of that. Like a building that had, look, the charity spot written on it. Look at all the cool shit we do with the charity money. I had never seen that fucking building.

SC1.89

Extinction

Making the world a better place

Dinosaurs are extinct because they didn't have a space program.

99.8 percent

Red giant. 99.8 percent of everything that has ever lived here is permanently extinct. We are going to be permanently extinct. Well, unless, we get off our ass and actually do something about it. Who are these people that need to magically 'get off their ass' seems like some euphemistic bullshit. Of every single living thing on this planet is permanently extinct. It is the. Extinction is the rule, not the exception. We too will be extinct soon if we don't get our act together. What does getting our act together look like? An asteroid will definitely destroy all life on this planet unless we catch it and redirect it before it gets here.

Probability? Designer viruses will kill many of us once kids can hack together viruses at home as easily as they are hacking websites and the PlayStation network today.

X events

I prefer to focus on this less because I know 100 percent I will be dying soon, and of what? Its very, very unlikely these things are going to kill me. From a me centric focus, it would be a misallocation of resources. If you care about future people more than you care4 about yourself, it would greatly amplify the importance of extinction events, because they affect not only you, but everyone like you both now and for the rest of time exponentially. It's exponential because the number of souls that would be caused to never exist through human extinction would not only be those not born today, but all of the (xx exponential or geographic?) off spring they would have had down through the rest of time. More at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/B612_Foundation

One of the skype founders hobbies is to look at these extinction level events. Really smart and effective people like Bill Gates and Elon Musk are working on their projects.

Asteroids

Virus

Maybe one of these cool viruses trapped in ice right now, thaws out because of random or man caused warming of the global climate.

Gray goop

Could we be this close to extinct?

Risk	Estimated probability from an expert survey for human extinction before 2100
Overall probability	19%
Molecular nanotechnology weapons	5%
Super intelligent AI	5%
Non-nuclear wars	4%
Engineered pandemic	2%
Nuclear wars	1%
Nanotechnology accident	0.5%
Natural pandemic	0.05%
Nuclear terrorism	0.03%

Table source: [Future of Humanity Institute](#), 2008.^[13]

From <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_catastrophic_risk>

<http://www.existential-risk.org/>

Business

Sales people are amazing because they cause a chain of “do” events to occur

That’s why sales people are so amazing because they convince you to let someone else do something for you, and then by proxy you have done something for yourself, because then someone else is going to have more money to pay you to do whatever it is that you do for them. Instead of doing something for yourself, and building it yourself and learning how to do it. When you pay someone else to do that thing for you what you in affect what you are doing is giving someone else the ability to then use the money that you gave them or the good will that you gave them, and use that to entice somebody (who may even be you) in order to do something. Basically when you purchase something from someone else because it was sold to you either through great text or viral marketing of some sort, then by proxy you are doing something for yourself. By letting someone else sell you and taking their goods, you are improving your life. They actually just caused you to do more work for someone else, because you now need to replace the money that is missing.

It's pretty funny how everyone villainizes corporations, for instance the way that they want to pretend that you are an independent contractor instead of a real employee, or to do whatever they need to make sure that you are a part time employee and not a full time one, because then they would have to pay you benefits and you would have more rights. That is to say, it could be that these are evil and underhanded behaviors, however to hate the corporation is the wrong tactic, for there really is no such thing as a corporation, it's just other people, you have to hate the individuals, and if a company is evil, you should name the person making it so, not give them a shield of anonymity by naming the company.

"I think that with pricing volatility and randomness to your wholesaler chain or your retailer chain you can entice competitors to come on to the market only to be blown out by your lower prices as established incumbent, and then if you don't choose to load enough before the prices, then, you get the benefits of the higher prices for a period. I think that there is a method by which you can produce the amount of margin that you lose to competitors by having randomized price increases that come and go and are unpredictable."

R141

You know I hear about people pricing in the future and commodities trades and speculation,

and for that to be true, for some event to occur and to not actually change the price because it was already accounted for, I think what that would have to mean is that the people that bought and hold hoping that it went up were all wrong and they got fucked. And so basically if you believe that people can price things in before they occur, well then the people that are doing the pricing it doesn't work. It seems like, the people that are expecting the future to be different are having to be wrong about it. I don't know, maybe that little tiny margin and nothing more is enough for them – the difference between today and the expected.

R235

System where you can't tell an employer that an employee was bad is pretty shitty for everybody.

R601

Imagine the perverse incentives of paying people that make money when you make money and don't give a shit about when they lose all your money because they don't lose any of their own. The whole hedge fund fucking volatility amplification for profit with the occasional too big to fail bail out bonus pay off.

R368

Entrepreneurship is the motivational system of the economic super intelligence, just as motivation just as should get done system of the singular human intelligence.

R519

There's a constant battle going on between the brands of the world trying to maintain margin and have high prices to attract distributors and retailers with while still being able to sell at a lower price to other countries that can't afford that high-price bullshit. As far as I'm concerned that's a battle for these brands to fuck over the majority of the people and hook up some people with a really, really reasonable deal, which they should already be giving to everyone else.

R552

If you are able to magically reduce a company's cost of products to zero, you actually haven't done much for their business. Let's say a business gets 100 customers a year they make \$100,000 per customer, that's \$1,000,000 a year, their cost of goods was \$500,000 so you reduce their costs of goods to zero which makes them an extra \$500,000 and that's it.

Now, what if someone else wasn't able to affect their cost of goods at all except, that they could increase their sales by 10 fold. Well, now they're making \$5,000,000 divided by 2 which is \$2.5 million profit. Which is more valuable to them? The guy that can reduce their cost to zero which by the way they can't go below zero, that's your limit. Or, the guy the increase their sale by 10 fold, 100 fold, 1,000 fold. That's actually doable. That's actually a thing you can do unless you've already got insane market share. When people want to make a lot of money and get rich, I try and tell them to get on the sales side because it's got exponential growth capacity whereas cost savings, manufacturing differences and those things do not have exponential growth capacity at all unless you combine them with the required sales increases.

R358

Scalable Business & Structure I asked my father last night how hard he works, and he said 7 days a week during the summer, and 5 days a week during the winter, and during the summer there would be 14 hour days. It amazes me how he can work that hard and not be wealthy. I was in that business with him doing the same work that he did, and it turns out

that in some businesses it is very hard to become wealthy, because you know if you are in an industry that's been around for a long time, there's no margin in it, and the margins will get smaller, the costs will get higher.

Sometimes the price that you charge doesn't increase the same way that your cost basis does, and thus there are some businesses that you don't want to be in. There's a lot that you don't want to be in. it's extremely hard to scale. When I got out of my dad's business and went into selling boxes, I could sell ten times as many boxes in a year. Same number of employees same amount of store space, probably a better cost basis with my vendors. If you're in the service industry, you cannot fix ten times as many in a year, you are fucked.

You need to hire ten times the people and now you need to hire somebody to manage the people, and you're going to get a lower quality of people. There are some businesses that do not fucking scale, and you are not going to get rich with them, unless you are willing to cheat. I wasn't and my father wasn't. In that business there are some people that. When you call them out to fix your shit they break it and now you need to pay a lot because it's broken because they broke it. If you get one of those disingenuous evil cocksuckers that comes out and does more harm than good those guys get rich I'm quite sure, because they do three times the volume of sales, because every call that they go on doesn't result in a 125\$ bill, it comes out to a 1250\$ bill, because they destroyed it.

Unless you are willing to steal, there are businesses that once they have been around long enough, and there's nothing new and the barrier to entry is low, you're not going to make money. My friend tony says that he wants to do a business, I met him at a business conference, I still love business I'm addicted to thinking about it. Almost everything good that I have in my life has been the result of business, if not one that I owned giving me the money to purchase a thing good or service. It's been the other side of the transaction, I am able to live in a nice place, and a long time ago someone built it. That someone was probably a business. I have clothes that I enjoy wearing, because being naked in the cold sucks, pretty much being naked when you're not on top of someone else maybe it's not that great, for you ladies out there maybe you prefer standing or being on the bottom who knows. Maybe you are a power bottom. The moral of the story is that almost everything that you enjoy in your life whether you are a capitalist or a hippie or a business psycho is a result of people working hard, and in a structure which we call a business.

Thank god we have businesses, because the other structures that allow people to be productive, well they are usually shittier. Slavery is one such thing that allows production without business. Family slavery being too young to make decisions for yourself is another form of production without business. In my life the computers I use the clothes I wear the food I eat, and everything I enjoy that enriches my life is quite often the product of businesses. If you're not in love with businesses you're pretty much not paying attention to the world you fucking live in. Everything that's good in this world eh 90% of it, it's the result of a business, and so starting one can be a beautiful thing. Starting one is how you give people a higher and better purpose for their life than they would have otherwise had.

Without the business infrastructure that people are currently engaged in or depending on your perspective "trapped in", you know a lot of people might sit at home, be lazy, do nothing, live in mud huts instead of fucking cool concrete buildings, shit in buckets instead of cool porcelain toilets. Can you imagine if you had to make a toilet out of porcelain? I have no idea how to make a porcelain at all, even if you gave me a diagram for a toilet. Unless I had some PVC laying around and some glue I'm not sure how I'd make it, so thank god for toilets & plumbing, thank god for the English language and the roads that we drive on, and the concept of reciprocity, and the concept of owing and fairness which allow people to

work together. The only reason you show up to work is because you think you getting a pay check on Friday, you've got a good reason to believe that you will, because you know if they say that they are going to pay you and they don't, then some other people with guns and violence are going to incarcerate them on your behalf, you won't even have to do it. That's pretty cool, it's cool that we found a way to control people to the degree that the only people that are allowed to execute violence for the most part have your best interest in mind.

R157

Some things are counter intuitive like trade-ins. So, if you want to get rid of something that you own, the worst person to sell it to is the person that sells the same thing of the same category to you - new. Because they have a relationship with the manufacturer or distribution channel that allows him to purchase that category or the exact thing at the lowest possible price. Therefore, they want to give you the absolute least amount of value for the thing that you're trading-in. Should be better off taking the thing that you're trading-in, selling it to anybody else in the world and then using the money that came from that, because you are providing a more value to these people, because they can't get it this cheaply than you would be by trading-in something.

R143

New Business

I'll explain it to you from the processor's perspective. New business starts up. New business gets customers. New business bills cards. New business pretends to ship products. New business gets paid. One month later, people start complaining. "Where's my fucking product?" Uh oh. New business disappears. Credit card company - credit card processing company missing lots of money. How does credit card processing company avoid this? They can't. They cannot. What do they do? They try and reduce that shittiness by holding some of your money for six months. Why six months? Because after six months, you can't charge back anymore. Unless it's an AMEX, I know you can do it for a year.

Insurance companies have pretty accurate statistical data

Now let me tell you how good these numbers are, right? Christopher Hitchens says it best. I'm sure someone even more interesting previous to him probably said something similar. Outrageous claims demand outrageous evidence. If you want to make very strong claims, you should have very strong evidence.

There's an industry called the insurance industry. It's very profitable. They make money knowing how someone just like you is going to die and when. They live or die by that knowledge. They put it into cool little tables called actuarial tables. And they're called actuarial tables because it's how the world actually is. Actually, that might be wrong, but it sounds cool. I have to look up the spelling on actuarial. But I wouldn't be surprised if it is the case.

SC1.47

Insurance companies are paid to be accurate

If insurance companies were wrong, they go out of business. Turns out, they're not wrong. Groups of people, large numbers average out very nicely and fit very properly into these tables and have been fitting in there for a 100 years. They know what you're going to die from and when you're going to die from it. They know how your behavior affects that. "Oh, you smoke? You're going to die this much earlier." "Oh, you skydive? You're going to die this much earlier". That's the real world, man. If you don't want to get hit by a car, you know the options you have? You cannot drive.

SC1.48

Military Grade Products

Another funny thing is, military spec and military grade products when I used to play paint ball, are these swamp boots; because I thought it would be great for the swampy-crappy

mud that I was running around in; and they were terrible! And if you think about it, the reason they were terrible is because, they were designed to be mass produced at the lowest price possible and just barely make the grade, they're definitely were not designed for peak performance at all. And so the things in the world that are designed for peak performance are very, very rarely military things, at least in regards to infantry.

You know I hear about people pricing in the future and commodities trades and speculation, and for that to be true, for some event to occur and to not actually change the price because it was already accounted for, I think what that would have to mean is that the people that bought and hold hoping that it went up were all wrong and they got fucked. Basically if you believe that people can price things in before they occur, well then the people that are doing the pricing, it doesn't. It seems like, uh, the people that are expecting the future to be different are having to be wrong about it, right? Maybe that little tiny margin and nothing more is enough for them – the difference between today and the expected.

Business Improvements

McDonalds should be automated

So McDonalds cheese burgers get shoved into little tray slide things as soon as they put them in bags, the next one pops into place so they can put that in the bag. If they are going to distribute the sandwiches that way why do I have to talk to a human to get in the middle of my money and the sandwich why doesn't the sandwich just get sent to me like a can of soda, and I can stick my money in without having to deal with those idiots.

0

Queue Design

Queues for taxis should have multiple loading spots at the front of the queue, like well-designed airports.

False importance

So these giant companies that think they are so very important, aren't actually that important. You see, the deal is that your local restaurant is actually much more important to you, or your electricity provider. It is because these companies like Facebook or Yahoo do a very little bit for lots and lots of people. It's not that these giant companies actually matter that much at all to any individual, however, they have the ability to touch so very many more people that they look lots more important than the companies that actually are important, but don't get to affect so very many people so lightly.

Economicsuali

Tragedies

One of the biggest tragedies is that we want to keep our ideas secrets. Think about all of the times you have been interacting with a business and thought of a really good idea they should implement, or noticed how they could do something better, but didn't tell them about it. Or think about all of the good ideas that you've had that you thought would make a good business or invention that you didn't tell anyone about. Every time one of those ideas dies inside your mind, never acted upon, sometimes even forgotten, it's a great loss to the world, because there's all kinds of people out there that have so much free time, and literal boredom that would love to act on a great idea, hell, might even have the tools ready to execute a great idea, but they never learn about it, because you know that if you spread that idea before you have the ability to make any money on it, then the best part of the idea, the part where you get to be rich and respected for coming up with such a cool idea are lost.

Because of the artificially low interest rates fiat currency allows, we will have constant boom and bust cycles. Artificially low interest rates require miss-investment and mal-investment in an attempt to not lose money to the passage of time and the fucking government currency

printing presses on overdrive.

This requirement to invest even when there is nothing good to invest in means that all that beautiful sweet tasty capital goes to the "risk takers". Taking risks with other people's money. The people that benefit the most from all this free money are those that get it first. Let's be the people that get it first.

Tax

Tax avoidance for all

Let's level the playing field and have a fair game.

If you're a single person and you make 100k at work, they take 40k

If you start a company, You still pay the 40k, because you own your company.

If you get a partner, yep, you still pay for every dollar you make.

If you go public, yay, now you don't pay income tax anymore, now you don't pay 40k when you make 100k. Now you get to pay fucking 0. Yes, 0. Your company can increase in value by a million dollars, and you will pay 0 dollars of tax. So why is that? Explain to me why the poor sons of bitches who have to break their balls every morning working to make ends meet have to pay infinitely more tax than the people who are lucky enough to not have to work at all/

And how does it help the world that those that are smart enough to find a way off the treadmill of non-fulfilling work, now get to opt out of being productive and waste their lives dicking around on yachts, and rubbing elbows with other rich and nonproductive people?

The world would be a better place if the more bad ass you were, the more bad ass you had to be. I wasted 5 years traveling hotels, and another 5 nightclubbing. If I wasn't so successful financially both I and the world would have been better off. It's like super wealthy musicians dying from drugs, and being over respected. The lack of respect they used to get drove them to greatness, and the achievement beyond their dreams basically destroyed them. Don't meet your heroes, and let's not over reward people and kill them.

If you're a small business and you

I, everyone needs to do what Ikea is doing, so that the laws actually need to get changed instead of only helping the companies that need the help the least, and amplifying the already massive advantage they have as incumbents over new entrants to the market. When will we see a better IKEA? Why isn't there a non-minimalist version of Ikea already? Basically what we have with this giant companies paying no taxes bullshit is a monoculture that is as all monocultures, not robust, for it is not properly submitting itself to the will of the masses, for it is starving the masses of choice.

You must have choice to allow the selection of excellence. If you have no choice, you can't enforce excellence. Monopolies are bad for all parties involved. Well, I guess they are ok for the Monopoly, if all you care about is profit, and not net good for the world, or excellence in nonprofit for a single entity at the expense of everyone else.

Tax people on what they already have

What would happen if you tax people with what they already have, not their income. I mean, when you tax people with what they don't have yet they don't (won't) think it's theirs, which is their income, I guess, I don't know. Practice actually our tax once we already received it. But I think it would feel different if we had to like, have the government take a share of someone's property and then, every year they take another share, and then one day the government has more than you do and they get to sell it. It is also interesting that you have to have the majority of the ownership of

this thing, to make a decision for it. It's weird that it doesn't end up being just some other percentage, that's not fifty-one percent.

R140

Productivity

"My friend Tony says, how do you measure the productiveness of the country? Literally by measuring its products. Its gross domestic product output."

R153

Tragedy of the commons

This should be the part where we talk about the solutions to the tragedy of the commons. One such solution is to have participants lock a part of their money for use as soon as a certain condition is met, for instance if you wanted to build a sidewalk for a private community. It would not be very useful for every person to pay for just the sidewalk in front of their property, and then be responsible for its construction. It's very likely that the staggered construction of multiple parties using different materials, different construction methods, and at different times would lead to reduced user experience. Probably many of the new blocks laid down would get concrete splatter on the blocks already laid.

You can bet that someone wants a wooden sidewalk, and another asphalt, and someone is seeing if they can get away with hardened mud. Thus the solution is to have everyone lock the funds into a conditional contract where no one's funds are actually used until there are enough funds to complete the project, a good analogy would be that of a sling shot. You can't really do much with a long shot unless you have the strength and room available to pull the sling back far enough, the same is true for any project, it's not so useful to start something that you can't finish, as an unfinished thing is often much uglier and less useful than a finished thing. If you decide to rotate the tires on your car, and leave a wheel off you won't have a useful car anymore.

Tragedy of the Commons

The tragedy of the Commons is when people are chewing the same problem over and over again. Something has to be done, but nobody wants to take the responsibility. For example, if you are developing Lighthouse, who should be paying for it? Who is going to put their money first and then wait for anybody else to pitch in? Nevertheless, the last one who makes the move gets all the advantages. Or how do you come up to people and ask them to invest in your business? There is a cryptographic solution like different crowd-funding projects on websites like Kickstarter. It takes just a little bit of effort to do marketing and set up a billing process. But what is the point to go to a highly saturated market with so many projects? There is a big chance for you to lose, especially when competing against girls and Bitcoin.

SC1.20

Tragedy of the Commons

Is that overcome-able? Surely. Surely it'll go away. The liquidity will increase, the [inaudible 101:08.0] will reduce, the availability of peer-to-peer transfer is - which basically operate it like a zero [inaudible 101:14.4] will increase and are increasing through services like local bitcoins. Why did I mention all that? Because a way - there's two way to solve bitcoin's problems. One is to crowdfund marketing for it. If we can have marketing on television for sponges and mops and fucking fruits and whatever the bullshit the world is being marketed, well then, we should have marketing for this world changing thing that changes the world. That's amazing. But it's not happening.

Why? Tragedy of the commons. Okay, how do you solve it? Well, we need people who are going to benefit from it financially, the stakeholders to put some fucking money in.

If you got a million dollars of bitcoin, you need to put \$5,000 of bitcoin in, which I think is like, 0.5%. You need to put 0.5% of your - you can check the math. I'm not sure on it - into this fund. We're not going to use the money until enough other people put the money in there, okay? This is like the Lighthouse Project who did this, but an arbitrary could do this. It was a lot of other - Kickstarter could do this. There's a lot of ways to do this crowdfunding thing. It's something I could personally do. But here's the problem: I could also just do that for myself and take 100% of the gains for myself. And I don't hold enough Bitcoins to shine a light compared to these other guys, right? SC1.100

Americans paycheck away from the street

https://www.reddit.com/r/news/comments/3zq3gr/most_americans_are_one_paycheck_a_way_from_the/

Americans have no savings

https://www.reddit.com/r/personalfinance/comments/3y6j40/62_of_americans_have_under_1000_in_savings/

How bad winning the lottery is

Someone asked me to repost my comment from another thread here, so here you go.

Thanks [/u/snatcharelli](#)

Congratulations! You just won millions of dollars in the lottery! That's great.

Now you're fucked.

No really.

You are.

You're fucked.

If you just want to skip the biographical tales of woe of some of the math-tax protagonists, skip on down to the next comment, to see what to do in the event you win the lottery.

You see, it's something of an open secret that winners of obnoxiously large jackpots tend to end up badly with alarming regularity. Not the \$1 million dollar winners. But anyone in the nine-figure range is at high risk. Eight-figures? Pretty likely to be screwed. Seven-figures?

Yep. Painful. Perhaps this is a consequence of the sample. The demographics of lottery players might be exactly the wrong people to win large sums of money. Or perhaps money is the root of all evil. Either way, you are going to have to be careful. Don't believe me?

Consider this:

Large jackpot winners face double digit multiples of probability versus the general population to be the victim of:

- Homicide (something like 20x more likely)

- Drug overdose

- Bankruptcy (how's that for irony?)

- Kidnapping

- And triple digit multiples of probability versus the general population rate to be:

- Convicted of drunk driving

- The victim of Homicide (at the hands of a family member) 120x more likely in this case, ain't love grand?

- A defendant in a civil lawsuit

- A defendant in felony criminal proceedings

Believe it or not, your biggest enemy if you suddenly become possessed of large sums of money is... you. At least you will have the consolation of meeting your fate by your own hand. But if you can't manage it on your own, don't worry. There are any number of willing participants ready to help you start your vicious downward spiral for you. Mind you, many of these will be "friends," "friendly neighbors," or "family." Often, they won't even have evil intentions. But, as I'm sure you know, that makes little difference in the end. Most aren't evil. Most aren't malicious. Some are. None are good for you.

Jack Whittaker, a Johnny Cash attired, West Virginia native, is the poster boy for the dangers of a lump sum award. In 2002 Mr. Whittaker (55 years old at the time) won what was, also

at the time, the largest single award jackpot in U.S. history. \$315 million. At the time, he planned to live as if nothing had changed, or so he said. He was remarkably modest and decent before the jackpot, and his ship sure came in, right? Wrong.

Mr. Whittaker became the subject of a number of personal challenges, escalating into personal tragedies, complicated by a number of legal troubles.

Whittaker wasn't a typical lottery winner either. His net worth at the time of his winnings was in excess of \$15 million, owing to his ownership of a successful contracting firm in West Virginia. His claim to want to live "as if nothing had changed" actually seemed plausible. He should have been well equipped for wealth. He was already quite wealthy, after all. By all accounts he was somewhat modest, low profile, generous and good natured. He should have coasted off into the sunset. Yeah. Not exactly.

Whittaker took the all-cash option, \$170 million, instead of the annuity option, and took possession of \$114 million in cash after \$56 million in taxes. After that, things went south. Whittaker quickly became the subject of a number of financial stalkers, who would lurk at his regular breakfast hideout and accost him with suggestions for how to spend his money. They were unemployed. No, an interview tomorrow morning wasn't good enough. They needed cash NOW. Perhaps they had a sure-fire business plan. Their daughter had cancer. A niece needed dialysis. Needless to say, Whittaker stopped going to his breakfast haunt. Eventually, they began ringing his doorbell. Sometimes in the early morning. Before long he was paying off-duty deputies to protect his family. He was accused of being heartless. Cold. Stingy.

Letters poured in. Children with cancer. Diabetes. MS. You name it. He hired three people to sort the mail. A detective to filter out the false claims and the con men (and women) was retained.

Brenda, the clerk who had sold Whittaker the ticket, was a victim of collateral damage. Whittaker had written her a check for \$44,000 and bought her house, but she was by no means a millionaire. Rumors that the state routinely paid the clerk who had sold the ticket 10% of the jackpot winnings hounded her. She was followed home from work. Threatened. Assaulted. Whittaker's car was twice broken into, by trusted acquaintances who watched him leave large amounts of cash in it. \$500,000 and \$200,000 were stolen in two separate instances. The thieves spiked Whittaker's drink with prescription drugs in the first instance. The second incident was the handiwork of his granddaughter's friends, who had been probing the girl for details on Whittaker's cash for weeks.

Even Whittaker's good-faith generosity was questioned. When he offered \$10,000 to improve the city's water park so that it was more handicap accessible, locals complained that he spent more money at the strip club. (Amusingly this was true).

Whittaker invested quite a bit in his own businesses, tripled the number of people his businesses employed (making him one of the larger employers in the area) and eventually had given away \$14 million to charity through a foundation he set up for the purpose. This is, of course, what you are "supposed" to do. Set up a foundation. Be careful about your charity giving. It made no difference in the end. To top it all off, Whittaker had been accused of ruining a number of marriages. His money made other men look inferior, they said, wherever he went in the small West Virginia town he called home. Resentment grew quickly. And festered. Whittaker paid four settlements related to this sort of claim. Yes, you read that right. Four.

His family and their immediate circle were quickly the victims of odds-defying numbers of overdoses, emergency room visits and even fatalities. His granddaughter, the eighteen-year-old "Brandi" (who Whittaker had been giving a \$2100.00 per week allowance) was found dead after having been missing for several weeks. Her death was, apparently, from a drug

overdose, but Whittaker suspected foul play. Her body had been wrapped in a tarp and hidden behind a rusted-out van. Her seventeen-year-old boyfriend had expired three months earlier in Whittaker's vacation house, also from an overdose. Some of his friends had robbed the house after his overdose, stepping over his body to make their escape and then returning for more before stepping over his body again to leave. His parents sued for wrongful death claiming that Whittaker's loose purse strings contributed to their son's death. Amazingly, juries are prone to award damages in cases such as these. Whittaker settled. Again.

Even before the deaths, the local and state police had taken a special interest in Whittaker after his new-found fame. He was arrested for minor and less minor offenses many times after his winnings, despite having had a nearly spotless record before the award. Whittaker's high profile couldn't have helped him much in this regard. In 18 months Whittaker had been cited for over 250 violations ranging from broken tail lights on every one of his five new cars, to improper display of renewal stickers. A lawsuit charging various police organizations with harassment went nowhere and Whittaker was hit with court costs instead.

Whittaker's wife filed for divorce, and in the process froze a number of his assets and the accounts of his operating companies. Caesars in Atlantic City sued him for \$1.5 million to cover bounced checks, caused by the asset freeze.

Today Whittaker is badly in debt, and bankruptcy looms large in his future. But, hey, that's just one example, right? Wrong.

Nearly one third of multi-million-dollar jackpot winners eventually declare bankruptcy.

Some end up worse. To give you just a taste of the possibilities, consider the fates of:

Billie Bob Harrell, Jr.: \$31 million. Texas. 1997. As of 1999: Committed suicide in the wake of incessant requests for money from friends and family. "Winning the lottery is the worst thing that ever happened to me. ☹"

William Buda☹ Post: \$16.2 million. Pennsylvania. 1988. In 1989: Brother hires a contract murderer to kill him and his sixth wife. Landlady sued for portion of the jackpot. Convicted of assault for firing a gun at a debt collector. Declared bankruptcy. Dead in 2006.

Evelyn Adams: \$5.4 million (won TWICE 1985, 1986). As of 2001: Poor and living in a trailer gave away and gambled most of her fortune.

Suzanne Mullins: \$4.2 million. Virginia. 1993. As of 2004: No assets left.

Shefik Tallmadge: \$6.7 million. Arizona. 1988. As of 2005: Declared bankruptcy.

Thomas Strong: \$3 million. Texas. 1993. As of 2006: Died in a shoot-out with police.

Victoria Zell: \$11 million. 2001. Minnesota. As of 2006: Broke. Serving seven-year sentence for vehicular manslaughter.

Karen Cohen: \$1 million. Illinois. 1984. As of 2000: Filed for bankruptcy. As of 2006: Sentenced to 22 months for lying to federal bankruptcy court.

Jeffrey Dampier: \$20 million. Illinois. 1996. As of 2006: Kidnapped and murdered by own sister-in-law.

Ed Gildein: \$8.8 million. Texas. 1993. As of 2003: Dead. Wife saddled with his debts. As of 2005: Wife sued by her own daughter who claimed that she was taking money from a trust fund and squandering cash in Las Vegas.

Willie Hurt: \$3.1 million. Michigan. 1989. As of 1991: Addicted to cocaine. Divorced. Broke. Indicted for murder.

Michael Klingebiel: \$2 million. As of 1998 sued by own mother claiming he failed to share the jackpot with her.

Janite Lee: \$18 million. 1993. Missouri. As of 2001: Filed for bankruptcy with \$700 in assets.

EDIT: Continued below due to character limit

[permalink](#)
[embed](#)

[\[-\]BlakeClass](#) 1555 points 1 year ago

So, what the hell DO you do if you are unlucky enough to win the lottery?

This is the absolutely most important thing you can do right away: NOTHING.

Yes. Nothing.

DO NOT DECLARE YOURSELF THE WINNER yet.

Do NOT tell anyone. The urge is going to be nearly irresistible. Resist it. Trust me.

/ 1. IMMEDIATELY retain an attorney.

Get a partner from a larger, NATIONAL firm. Don't let them pawn off junior partners or associates on you. They might try, all law firms might, but insist instead that your lead be a partner who has been with the firm for a while. Do NOT use your local attorney. Yes, I mean your long-standing family attorney who did your mother's will. Do not use the guy who fought your dry-cleaner bill. Do not use the guy you have trusted your entire life because of his long and faithful service to your family. In fact, do not use any firm that has any connection to family or friends or community. TRUST me. This is bad. You want someone who has never heard of you, any of your friends, or any member of your family. Go the closest big city and walk into one of the national firms asking for one of the "Trust and Estates" partners you have previously looked up on <http://www.martindale.com> from one of the largest 50 firms in the United States which has an office near you. You can look up attorneys by practice area and firm on Martindale.

/ 2. Decide to take the lump sum.

Most lotteries pay a really pathetic rate for the annuity. It usually hovers around 4.5% annual return or less, depending. It doesn't take much to do better than this, and if you have the money already in cash, rather than leaving it in the hands of the state, you can pull from the capital whenever you like. If you take the annuity you won't have access to that cash. That could be good. It could be bad. It's probably bad unless you have a very addictive personality. If you need an allowance managed by the state, it is because you didn't listen to point #1 above.

Why not let the state just handle it for you and give you your allowance?

Many state lotteries pay you your "allowance" (the annuity option) by buying U.S. treasury instruments and running the interest payments through their bureaucracy before sending it to you along with a hunk of the principal every month. You will not be beating inflation by much, if at all. There is no reason you couldn't do this yourself, if a low single-digit return is acceptable to you.

You aren't going to get even remotely the amount of the actual jackpot. Take our old friend Mr. Whittaker. Using Whittaker is a good model both because of the reminder of his ignominious decline, and the fact that his winning ticket was one of the larger ones on record. If his situation looks less than stellar to you, you might have a better perspective on how "large" your winnings aren't.

Whittaker's "jackpot" was \$315 million. He selected the lump-sum cash up-front option, which knocked off \$145 million (or 46% of the total) leaving him with \$170 million. That was then subject to withholding for taxes of \$56 million (33%) leaving him with \$114 million.

In general, you should expect to get about half of the original jackpot if you elect a lump sum (maybe better, it depends). After that, you should expect to lose around 33% of your already pruned figure to state and federal taxes. (Your mileage may vary, particularly if you live in a state with aggressive taxation schemes).

/ 3. Decide right now, how much you plan to give to family and friends. This really shouldn't be more than 20% or so. Figure it out right now. Pick your number. Tell your lawyer. That's it. Don't change it. 20% of \$114 million is \$22.8 million. That leaves you with \$91.2 million. DO NOT CONSULT WITH FAMILY when deciding how much to give to family. You are going to get advice that is badly tainted by conflict of interest, and if other family members find out that Aunt Flo was consulted and they weren't you will never hear the end of it. Neither will Aunt Flo. This might later form the basis for an allegation that Aunt Flo unduly influenced you and a lawsuit might magically appear on this basis. No, I'm not kidding. I know of one circumstance (related to a business windfall, not a lottery) where the plaintiffs WON this case. Do NOT give anyone cash. Ever. Period. Just don't. Do not buy them houses. Do not buy them cars. Tell your attorney that you want to provide for your family, and that you want to set up a series of trusts for them that will total 20% of you after tax winnings. Tell him you want the trust empowered to fund higher education, some help (not a total) purchase of their first home, some provision for weddings and the like, whatever. Do NOT put yourself in the position of handing out cash. Once you do, if you stop, you will be accused of being a heartless bastard (or bitch). Trust me. It won't go well. It will be easy to lose perspective. It is now the duty of your friends, family, relatives, hangers-on and their inner circle to skew your perspective, and they take this job quite seriously. Setting up a trust, a managed fund for your family that is in the double digit millions is AMAZINGLY generous. You need never have trouble sleeping because you didn't lend Uncle Jerry \$20,000 in small denomination unmarked bills to start his chain of deep-fried peanut butter pancake restaurants. ("Deep'n 'nutter Restaurants") Your attorney will have a number of good ideas how to parse this wealth out without turning your siblings/spouse/children/grandchildren/cousins/waitresses into the latest Paris Hilton.

EDIT: Continued below due to character Limit.

[permalink](#)
[embed](#)
[parent](#)

[\[-\]BlakeClass](#) 1366 points 1 year agox2

/ 4. You will be encouraged to hire an investment manager. Considerable pressure will be applied. Don't. Investment managers charge fees, usually a percentage of assets. Consider this: If they charge 1% (which is low, I doubt you could find this deal, actually) they have to beat the market by 1% every year just to break even with a general market index fund. It is not worth it, and you don't need the extra return or the extra risk. Go for the index fund instead if you must invest in stocks. This is a hard rule to follow. They will come recommended by friends. They will come recommended by family. They will be your second cousin on your mother's side. Investment managers will sound smart. They will have lots of cool acronyms. They will have nice PowerPoint presentations. They might (MIGHT) pay for your shrimp cocktail lunch at TGI Friday's while reminding you how poor their side of the family is. They live for this stuff. You should smile, thank them for their time, and then tell them you will get back to them next week. Don't sign ANYTHING. Don't write it on a cocktail napkin (lottery lawsuit cases have been won and lost over drunkenly scrawled cocktail napkin addition and subtraction figures with lots of zeros on them). Never call them back. Trust me. You will thank me later. This tactic, smiling, thanking people for their time, and promising to get back to people, is going to have to

become familiar. You will have to learn to say no gently, without saying the word "no." It sounds underhanded. Sneaky. It is. And its part of your new survival strategy. I mean the word "survival" quite literally.

Get all this figured out BEFORE you claim your winnings. They aren't going anywhere. Just relax.

/ 5. If you elect to be more global about your paranoia, use between 20.00% and 33.00% of what you have not decided to commit to a family fund IMMEDIATELY to purchase a combination of longer term U.S. treasuries (5 or 10 year are a good idea) and perhaps even another G7 treasury instrument. This is your safety net. You will be protected... from yourself.

You are going to be really tempted to starting being a big investor. You are going to be convinced that you can double your money in Vegas with your awesome Roulette system/by funding your friend's amazing idea to sell Lemming dung/buying land for oil drilling/by shorting the North Pole Ice market (global warming, you know). This all sounds tempting because "Even if I lose it all I still have \$XX million left! Anyone could live on that comfortably for the rest of their life." Yeah, except for 33% of everyone who won the lottery.

You're not going to double your money, so cool it. Let me say that again. You're not going to double your money, so cool it. Right now, you'll get around 3.5% on the 10 year U.S. treasury. With \$18.2 million (20% of \$91.2 mil after your absurdly generous family gift) invested in those you will pull down \$638,400 per year. If everything else blows up, you still have that, and you will be in the top 1% of income in the United States. So how about you not fuck with it. Eh? And that's income that is damn safe. If we get to the point where the United States defaults on those instruments, we are in far worse shape than worrying about money.

If you are really paranoid, you might consider picking another G7 or otherwise mainstream country other than the U.S. according to where you want to live if the United States dissolves into anarchy or Britney Spears is elected to the United States Senate. Put some fraction in something like Swiss Government Bonds at 3%. If the Swiss stop paying on their government debt, well, then you know money really means nothing anywhere on the globe anymore. I'd study small field sustainable agriculture if you think this is a possibility. You might have to start feeding yourself.

/ 6. That leaves, say, 80% of \$91.2 million or \$72.9 million.

Here is where things start to get less clear. Personally, I think you should dump half of this, or \$36.4 million, into a boring S&P 500 index fund. Find something with low fees. You are going to be constantly tempted to retain "sophisticated" advisers who charge "nominal fees." Don't. Period. Even if you lose every other dime, you have \$638,400 per year you didn't have before that will keep coming in until the United States falls into chaos. Fuck advisers and their fees. Instead, drop your \$36.4 million in the market in a low fee vehicle. Unless we have an unprecedented downturn the likes of which the United States has never seen, should return around 7.00% or so over the next 10 years. You should expect to touch not even a dime of this money for 10 or 15 or even 20 years. In 20 years \$36.4 million could easily become \$115 million.

/ 7. So you have put a safety net in place.

You have provided for your family beyond your wildest dreams. And you still have \$36.4 million in "cash." You know you will be getting \$638,400 per year unless the capital building is burning, you don't ever need to give anyone you care about cash, since they are provided for generously and responsibly (and can't blow it in Vegas) and you have a HUGE nest egg that is growing at market rates. (Given the recent dip, you'll be buying in at great prices for the market).

What now? Whatever you want. Go ahead and burn through \$36.4 million in hookers and blow if you want. You've got more security than 99% of the country. A lot of it is in trusts so even if you are sued your family will live well, and progress across generations. If your lawyer is worth his salt (I bet, he is) then you will be insulated from most lawsuits anyhow. Buy a nice house or two, make sure they aren't stupid investments though. Go ahead and be an angel investor and fund some startups, but REFUSE to do it for anyone you know. (Friends and money, oil and water - Michael Corleone) Play. Have fun. You earned it by putting together the shoe sizes of your whole family on one ticket and winning the jackpot.

[permalink](#)

[embed](#)

[parent](#)

[\[-\]heathtree](#) 360 points 1 year ago

Excellent advice. I used to work at a lottery (I even gave out the big novelty cheques sometimes) and I have told many family and friends that the smart people who win the lottery do not show up right away. The smart people follow most of the advice given in this most excellent series of posts. However, they also do a couple of other things:

change all telephone numbers and ensure the new ones are unlisted before going to claim the prize

stop home mail delivery. Get a PO Box, and if your postal service allows it, ensure that mail is only delivered if it is addressed to the family members whose names are listed as belonging to the PO Box. Change all your billing records to the new address and phone number before claiming the prize.

once you have eventually claimed the prize, do not read mail from sources you do not know. The sob stories will break your heart. Save yourself the anguish and do not read them

In some jurisdictions (including mine), you have to agree to some minor publicity when you collect your prize. This can frequently mean a photograph and your name in the media. I have a few pieces of advice for this:

only one person should collect the winnings. You want to minimize the chance that you are going to be recognized. If there is more than one person in the photo, then there is double the chance that one of you might get recognized. Try to be as anonymous as possible.

ask that the novelty cheque and subsequent media release name you without using your full name. So if you are John Quincy Smith, ask to be identified as "J.Q. Smith." This doesn't work as well if you have an uncommon family name, but in some cases it can help anonymize you a bit.

if you're likely to be photographed, then now's the time to play dress up. Wear a hat. Wear sunglasses if you can. Men, grow some facial hair. You are going to get your 15 minutes of fame, whether you like it or not, so my advice is to look as unidentifiable as possible when you go to get your prize.

if the lottery corporation has prize offices in more than one location, collect your prize at a location that is as far away as possible and/or where you know the fewest people before collecting the prize, you will have already made your arrangements for the funds. Collect the cheque and immediately deliver it (to the bank, to your lawyer, wherever you have made your previous arrangements).

as soon as you deposit your winnings, you and your family need to disappear for a month. Most of the excitement and focus will be in the immediate aftermath of you winning the prize. Now is the time for you and your family to rent a cottage on a beach in a foreign country and lay low

I think this advice, combined with the most excellent advice given above, will

help you to manage your winnings and hopefully insulate you a bit from the madness of a jealous public.

From

<https://www.reddit.com/r/AskReddit/comments/24vzgl/you_just_won_a_656_million_dollar_lottery_what_do/chba4bf?context=3>

Voguing to make funny of people that use lots of animated movements. Let the gay people have their own dance for fucks sake.

Jobs

How many truck drivers there are

More at: <http://www.npr.org/sections/money/2015/02/05/382664837/map-the-most-common-job-in-every-state>

Getting rich.

If you are a self-made man, often times people will ask you how they can become wealthy as well. Here's a funny way to look at it, if you were the only person on a deserted island, you would be exactly as wealthy as you made yourself. Want a house? Build it. Want a fancy dinner? Build it. Want a nice haircut? Do it.

Nations / Societies

Racism

If Sweden really wanted to help the world, they could just import all the violent criminals, cripples, from the rest of the world's crappy and ineffective jail systems, and just let them enrich their country. No reason to accept them slowly one by one, and at only say, 5 percent of the current immigrants? Mind as well go 100 percent! I mean they're already fucking over the women in those countries as evidenced by the gender ratios.

Somehow, facts are racist

Sadly, Europe is being taken over by this bullshit idea. How can you on one hand say people need extra help, and on the other hand say that they kick as much ass? How can you say racism is bad, and then use racism to benefit those you've judged to be inferior? Isn't the lack of racism to not be measuring the races and making laws to harm companies in order to benefit your desire to control other people to the ends you care about. In this case, benefitting one race over another race? If your anti-racism job placement gives a job to an African American instead of an American Indian or Indian, Indian, or Chinese person, how not racist are you? Hypocrite.

Great countries

So why as a great country like Germany, or any other European country would you need to import dog shit culture from outside your borders, when you get all the benefits and profitability of ownership while leaving the dogs hit somewhere else.

Amurricuh, give us ur oils

The god damn falsity of invading countries for "oil" The fucking oil price goes up, not down. The profits from the "American companies" that get contracts in the invaded country, or afraid to be invaded country, Good will hunting quote re CIA interference <https://www.YouTube.com/watch?v=l8rQNdBmPek>

You want oil? Make less bombs, and buy it with the money you saved. Maybe take the money you spent on bombs and work on more efficient fuel and air mixing, or piston shaping, or spark shaping with multiple spark plugs, or better manufacturing for cheaper turbos. You have a shitload of ways to cause more fuel efficiency through investment, and that's exactly what the far less funded car companies have done. They got you more miles on less gas, by investing money and time. The same progress could have occurred from the government joining the party and funding research and experiments in the same fucking way.

Progress isn't magic, smart people, with funding, applied over time towards a compelling and interesting goal. Hell, throw some recognition and competition in there, and you've got a recipe for success.

Size of societies

Because of the size of the societies we live in today, it's better to just move on whenever you hit some type of road block or speed bump or something than it is to try and, uh, punish or do some game theory shit on the people that have wronged you.

R219

Let's not pretend we are not territorial - nationalism is collective territoriality

Can we stop pretending that we don't care about territoriality? If you let someone within an inch of you they are too close to your personal space, you'll punch them. If someone comes in your house that you didn't invite, you'll punch them. When did this punching people that violate what we consider to be our property rights ("territoriality"), and so nationalism is just the combined collective execution of that rather normal, and rather effective (same reason that tigers have it) emotional program of excluding others to their own detriment so you can have a greater quality of life. Kind of the same reason we eat animals, they have a bad time we have a good time.

R99

Cultures and Governments

There's a lot of cultures where the people that are allowed to execute violence are not morally by code bound into what they can do. They take what they want by force, and it makes the lives around them much worse including their own, but they rarely see it. Take a guy like Putin who takes more and more for himself, but his country is fucked up. Name a Russian product or brand that you want. How do you take a superpower and cripple it to a point where you can't name a single thing that you want from there, and if they are not making any products that you want, they are probably not making and products that they want... so what are they fucking doing over there? Drinking vodka and doing that weird dance? There's got to be something more going on over there. They're probably working, they're probably working hard, but they're working hard on the wrong shit. Where does that come from?

Well that's a side result from corruption, that's a side effect of not having the right laws, not having the right investments, not attracting the right talent. Focusing on a language that isn't the global reserve language, where all the new science and film and culture is the most amplified, and has the best product. Do you want to be the king at the shitty fish tank or do you want to be like middle management at the fuckin awesome fish tank. Well that's what happens when you allow capitalism and business and goals that are aligned and effective law enforcement and contracts to take advantage of what works. It may not be the best thing we ever find. I mean we now have open source projects, where we can create things that capitalism cannot compete with. You couldn't pay to create Wikipedia, nearly regardless of how much you would spend, and if you did you would not make your money back. You could not pay to create IMDB. These crowd sourced, crowd funded.

R157

Distributing citizenship

In a country where they'll let anybody in and their sister, and they never kick anybody out, it's a little bit odd to have a policy of only distributing citizenship regardless of how long you've lived here or how much you've paid in taxes, only distributing it if you speak a fucking language that is totally irrelevant.

R249

Societies/Social Environment

Social change through disease

Visualize Bayes theorem <https://oscarbonilla.com/2009/05/visualizing-bayes-theorem/>

https://www.reddit.com/r/todayilearned/comments/4brnkvt/til_in_1980s_when_a_baboon_troop_was_hit_by_a/

Maybe one day the nerds will engineer such a thing using their home dna synthesizers.

<http://i.imgur.com/82mXfK6.png>

Government

The government sucks a little bit less than you think

You should probably be more grateful for the government than you think. It's confirmation bias; you only notice when the government fucks with you, and not when you're kept from being fucked with by the other citizens. For example, no one likes having a police car follow them around town while driving. However, you sure do love to watch that cop turn those lights on and chase down the guy that just blew through the red light you were just sitting at.

People think that their lives are going just fine without government intervention, however, what they don't understand is that without that hidden "intervention" that is actually happening, they'd be overrun with shitty other actors and citizens fucking them up. It is the hidden hand of the state fucking up other people that deserve it that allows you to think that the state isn't actually interfering with you, because it's not, it's interfering with all the people that would have been fucking you up otherwise. It's interfering with them so you don't have to.

Having courage

Risk management

Stand farther from street on crosswalks

Hazard versus outrage

Apparently you're more likely to be killed by the police than by terrorists in a ratio of: <http://www.snopes.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/gun-murders-per-100000-deaths.png> More at: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Micromort>

Real risk management

Real risk management. Less focus on terrorism, more focus on things that actually happen. Pools drown kids way more often than terrorists kill kids, how much money are we spending on pool safety? What about safer roads. Some intersections are vastly more dangerous than others, can't we spend more to fix that? Real properly weighted risk management where mathematical measurement of hazard is weighed more than emotional outrage. There is literally an entire Wikipedia page on the common errors in thinking and perception that humans make. Let's call out the places where we're making the errors in specific.

Energy distribution & reducing accidents

When you're on an airplane - well, they do it for car seats. When you're on an airplane, you [inaudible 46:06.2] incline a lot of the time. And so, you would need to recline the chairs more to make up for it. But it is totally safer, it is actually documented. And that's why I like it. This question will pop up every once in a while on Hacker News or Reddit, and people ask like, "If you're on a train, which seat's more safe? The front one or the back one?" That's why [inaudible 46:28.5] backwards, and the reason is because you die from specific parts of your body failing, and the likelihood that a specific part of your body fails is in direct proportion to the distribution of the energy.

If the energy is spread over a long distance, then you don't get crippled. But if it's spread over a short distance, then it causes a critical system failure in a certain spot. That's why bullets work so well. If a bullet was the size of your

body, it wouldn't work that well. Exactly. Exactly. That's how body armor works. It catches the bullet and redistributes the energy over a larger space so you don't get perforated. Sitting backwards has the same principle. Distributing the shitty force over the widest amount of area to increase the likelihood that you don't have a critical system failure.

SC1.50

Risk

People says it's rare to get killed by a shark, xx How few people are in the water though, probably like pit bulls, yeah, not dangerous as a percentage of total danger, however, take a look what percentage of dog attacks they are compared to total dogs.

Fuck global warming

If you think everyone's life has the same value, please do the things in this TED talk mosquito nets, clean water. Gates has a good handle on these things.

TSA

You know who else has a pretty crappy job? The TSA. Every time the TSA gets tested, to see if they can actually do their job, and prevent bad dangerous things from getting on planes. They fail. Pretty much every time they fail. What is the point? Do the bad guys not know how bad they are at their job, and they're scared off? How funny is this crap? Another thing, if you really did want to do security properly, you would do it as they do in Israel, where they screen you, the human, instead of caring what is in your bag.

An American TSA agent isn't trained to screen you, the human, its hard work reading people and asking the right questions. How many billions of dollars of increased productivity would the united states gain if we relaxed the bullshit scanning and patting and just either did things that were effective, or stopped the security theater. I don't like the security theater. No one likes the security theater, well, perhaps except for all the people employed by it, or the guys that sell those little metal detector wands. It's probably really hard to re-task their machinery that makes those fancy wands to make other stuff, they'd likely take a real big bit in profit if we weren't tickling all our passengers anymore.

Asset forfeiture

Apparently your money can be charged with a crime. Your credit cards can get maxed out when you get pulled over. Seems legit.

Voting

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Duverger%27s_law

Torture

Yes maybe in an ideal world, we could just have the police beat the shit out of small time offenders on site, maybe they wouldn't need to take up space in a jail, and maybe it would work great. Or maybe in this world that we live in, the police would not be perfect, and might often after a long day at work, or a harsh breakup, put the beat down on some people that didn't deserve it. Even in a world where torture might work, in small pockets, it must not be allowed, because too many normal humans will screw up its application, and then you have to torture those guys, for mis-torturing, etc. Oh, and wait, what about that constitution again, isn't there some guarantee against cruel and unusual punishment? What about the Geneva conventions? What about all those UN agreements? I guess good honest men knew with great certainty that torture was off limits, for everyone, even the great U.S. of A. Well I guess it's a good thing that it wouldn't make recruiting people to terrorism easier, if they could with a straight face say, hey these guys are torturing people that look just like you, they must be evil, who would do such a barbaric thing.

I don't thing becoming a terrorist is the best way to reduce terrorism. It's too asymmetrical.

The surface area of damage via terrorism a small party can do to a large party is vastly larger than the amount a large party can do to a smaller party, they just don't have enough people to terrorize. What do you think is more common ants biting people or people biting ants? Why is that? Ants bite humans all the time, perhaps we need to teach them a lesson? As obvious as it is that we can't teach ants lessons, perhaps since terror has been being fought by governments for thousands of years, and has never been yet eradicated by common anti-terror activity, it is an obvious waste of time. I can tell you with great certainty however that terror has been beaten quite often by non-common anti-terror activity. The spread of culture and more importantly, wellbeing and education is a far more powerful cure, and even pays back dividends.

It could easily be said that during world war II the Japanese and the Germans were pretty tyrannically terrible, and after their regimes were destroyed, we did not revel in their total destruction, for it was not in our best interests. We sent some of our smartest minds over there to help rebuild them and make them greater than they were before, and now look at the world we live in, the best cars from Germany and Japan, as well as the best cameras, and the best lenses, and many of the best machines of all kinds, and we do xx trillions of commerce together. I would suggest that these backwards societies that produce disproportionate amounts of terrorists would be better cured by exporting them a better quality of life and some American know how, because only the uncommon solutions have worked. I say disproportionate because even a pretty well run society still generates some terrorists. Even we in the great united states breed all kinds of terrorists of our own, school shootings, abortion clinic bombings, lots of famous serial killers.

Individually okay, terrible at scale

Some things are individually okay but, terrible at scale. You might be able to properly beat information out of a suspect and the next guy takes it too far, that's probably a terrible example. Surveillance, same thing, you might be able to properly just use searching for evil people and just do that without data ever leaking into bad hands. But scale, some other person comes and makes it fucked up. Because some things that should be legal, aren't. Fifteen year olds or fourteen year olds, driving. Maybe there are some Fourteen year olds should be able to drive, we take a short cut, to save money on testing, and just say no."

R148

Privacy

Encryption and cryptography are your friends

Legislating against encryption

Many good members of the government sword an oath to uphold the constitution, particularly from attackers foreign and domestic. That oath is only as useful at their ability to understand what the fuck the constitution actually says and is actually supposed to achieve.

Either lots of these guys haven't read it, or don't know how to derive meaning from it, because every single year the attacks on the constitution get more and more asinine.

First of all, you don't have the right to monitor everyone's communications. It is enshrined to be free from in the bill of rights, the freedom of press, and freedom of association, that freedom literally means the freedom from surveillance. You can't have the freedom of association with a 3rd person in your otherwise private conversation, Oh, and there's that pesky 4th amendment which makes it even more super clear, the freedom from warrantless searches and seizures, and even in that case, freedom from overly broad warrants. Is not global universal knowledge of all communications rather broad?

If you want to ignore everyone's rights, and become more totalitarian, and take on more of the traits that a rogue terrorist supporting state has, then yes, let's have a Panopticon for all (xx image of a Panopticon).

Now that we've ignored the constitution, and literally 3 of its 10 guarantees, what happens when we enforce these laws against encryption? Now all of your citizens can all be hacked quite easily by the real threats. What causes more harm in a year, identity theft, and credit card fraud, or terrorism? When you stop people from being able to be truly secure in their communications, guess who you' just helped. The terrorists, now it's easier for them to find funding, because it's as easy as getting some credit cards and banging them for cash.

Every single time you decide to cripple the effectiveness of your population for the sake of some boogie men, those boogie men take advantage of the errors of your ways. They could never directly harm you with billions of economic damage, they can only rely on your misappropriate response to do that job for them. How many lives have been wasted performing security theater patting down 90 year old ladies in wheel chairs and diapers flying to get medical care? At what point in the future does the theater stop and do those poor molesting bastards get a chance to find truly gainful employment that adds to the productivity of the nation? What about all the delays? Shall we pretend that they are not real costs, the really make the quality of life of all those that experience them worse?

Even if it were not theater, and we are going to pretend that some speed isn't worth some death, should we not then reduce all of the speed limits to 10mph, because there will obviously be less deaths from driving, only delays. No, I think people would quite quickly choose some more risk of injury and death, than drive 10 mph on the highway for any prolonged period of time.

Legislators, stop fucking over your citizenry and breaking their security, and weakening their encryption, and miss-responding to small threats. Stop helping the terrorists. Stop being the problem.

If somehow even now you aren't convinced, I have some more great news for you. The cat is out of the bag. One time pads, that have been perfectly protecting secrets for spies for 60 years, are easy to use, cheap, easy, you literally only need a pen, a piece of paper, and a book. Here, I'll show you how to do it. (xx, how to use one time pad)

Now no matter what dumb ass law your technically uneducated, too old to know any better, coward mode legislator can know that regardless of what poorly written, impossible to enforce, evil unconstitutional law he might get passed, it won't work. Encryption is just too god damn easy. You can even hide cool stuff in pictures of pretty cats, or anything else, and it's literally undetectable (steganography xx). "These guys failed to find a needle in a haystack, so they are lobbying for more hay". I hope that somewhere with something I ever write I can find something as compelling as that. Maybe they are stupid enough to try and ban all photos.

Whole lot of tech that hasn't affected the world yet

There's a whole lot of technology that hasn't had a chance to affect the world yet. Lots of this new technology is based around trust. Trust is a way that we have to save time. When you trust someone, you don't have to constantly keep

your eye on them. Sadly, trust is often misplaced, and penalized. If you trust into one hand, and shit into the other, guess which one will fill up first.

xx(this assumes everyone would forget the location without the writing) With this fancy new math we have ways that we can prove we know a thing, without telling you what that thing is, or we can prove that we told someone else a thing, and they know the thing, without ever having to tell you what the thing is. We even have ways to distribute trust now. Let's take an example for fun. You and your 2 brothers live in a country where bad things are happening, and you are lucky to have some gold put away so you can buy your way out. You guys bury the gold, and you all know where it is buried. Now you have a trust problem.

What if one of you gets caught, and gives up the location, now you've tripled the odds that your gold can all disappear. What if one of your brothers isn't so trust worthy, and wants that gold all for himself? Wouldn't it be cool if there was a way to hide the gold, and create a password so that the gold would only become available if all 3 of you presented your passwords.

The good news is that because of fancy cool math we have now, we can literally do that. Hell you can do it with just a pen and paper and a hell of a lot of free time. Multi-signature. Shamir's secret sharing.

Now you can hide all the money and knowledge and data you want. I love it when people talk about how they have nothing to hide. Hahaha. Then let's get those clothes off, and I'll have that email password. And while we're at it, tell me what you don't like about your friends and lovers. Oh and your family. Silence is what I hear. Everyone has secrets, and if you don't you are literally an asshole, no one wants to hear your negativity.

The same applies to "cloud" computing. There is no "cloud." It's just someone else's computer. Very ever so rarely you could need lots and lots of computers on short notice, and then it could be quite useful to have instant access to lots of them at once. It is still important to know that there's little magic, and much of what people want from the cloud, they can do with their own group of computers they already own, for free and with better privacy and security.

What is the difference between privacy and security you ask? Well they're very related, you can only attack what you are aware of, thus you need a breach of privacy to begin your attack on security. Privacy is a human right, and is necessary for the proper functioning of the human psychology.

Law

Differences

Differences is law mean that someone is always getting fucked over somewhere, what should the penalty be for those that enforce unjust laws? Why is marijuana or criticizing the Chinese government legal in some places and illegal in others? Insane government laws, surveillance state, selective enforcement, exporting terror, constitution free zone, minimum mandatory, minimum sentencing, adding on fake new crimes, like laundering, and the law that makes you retain documents if they're financial being used against anyone for anything to all core crimes. Sarbanes Oxley used so I can never delete anything ever. More and more laws every year. You couldn't know all the laws ever, even if you read all of them full time. They make them faster than you can read them.

Vandalism

Could vandalism survive as an effective strategy for humans in environments with more lax enforcement and it's harder to catch people because other parties in your group have less and by consequence you have more, because it's not like you're vandalizing your own shit.

R250

Speed limits

Another example of asymmetric warfare is speed limits. Imagine if every police officer pulled over every person that was speeding and all the people were speeding; well then the number of people pulled over would just equal the number of police available and then everyone else would get away with it.

R445

Adolescent penalties

Should criminal penalties be assigned with harsh cut off points in that, "oh you're an adolescent." Well then, you can be basically be punished for nothing, "oh your one day over adolescence", well you can get the death penalty. Is that reasonable or with more reason a more segregated non binary you know. "Oh you're in first grade". Okay then, you can be slightly responsible, second slightly more etc. Every time I see things grouped arbitrarily into on or off, in a world of complexity I have to imagine the on and off model isn't so great.

505

Stay outta jail

You can't talk yourself out of anything, only hurt.

More at:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Party_admission
<http://federalevidence.com/taxonomy/term/118>

Police

Everybody thinks that policemen are lawyers and judges, that's not what they train to do. Okay? If you go to your local police officer and have him write your will for you, or have him right your prenup for you, shoot yourself, you're not getting a good will, you're not getting a good prenup. He can't practice law. If a police officer could practice fucking law he's quite his dangerous underpaying job, and switch to the non-dangerous, high-paying job. Police men are not fucking lawyers.

R528

Military

Military industrial complex is wasting resources

Well, right now, we've got a military industrial complex. It's very effective, and it's stealing 15% or 20% of GDP from the United States every year. Maybe - call it 5%, [inaudible 39:38.5] some huge fucking number. It's too much. It's a waste of resources. With people rearranging rocks in the Middle East, and look how well that works out. It doesn't work. It hasn't worked. It has never worked. It's not going to work. If you tried [inaudible 39:57.2] building in the Middle East, you are fucked. Hard fucked. Look what happened.

We spent longer there than we spent in the World War II, literally. That's how fucking long the States has been there. And the trillion dollars that has been spent on that bullshit, you would've been better off burning the money. Literally. If would've just taken the trillion dollars and set it on fire, you would've got higher and better outcomes. Well, that's not so good. How do you get to a place like that? "Oh, well, no problem." You set up a system where you can print money for free so you don't actually have to abide any budgets. Fuck budgets, right? And that's definitely the case.

SC1.43

Running prisons is a prison

Aligning incentives

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kids_for_cash_scandal

For profit prisons, they like repeat business, so why would they rehabilitate?

If you have the highest percentage of people in jail of any culture in the history of mankind, you are doing lots of things wrong. Lots and lots of things. America has this problem. You know what sucks about putting lots of people in jail? You haven't imprisoned just the prisoners, you've imprisoned the guards as well. They are both made to wear uniforms. They are both made to sit in the same building. Actually you could say that the guard has it even worse than the prisoner during his shift, because the inmate can read a book, masturbate, isn't worried about getting fired.

The guard doesn't have as much freedom during his shift that the inmate does. It's even worse than that as well, some other poor bastard has to work another job to pay his taxes so they can be given to the guard. Basically we've got 3 people's lives fucked up over 1 prisoner. If you can find anyway, anyway at all to either make people less criminal, perhaps with education, perhaps with getting rid of some victimless crimes. You would save a lot of lives. Also, if my math is right, its more than just 3 lives that are screwed up, because the inmate, the guard, the guy who's tax money went to pay the guard, could all be putting their time and money into things which brought value to the world. You don't just waste their lives, you lose the things they would have done for you.

It's not just prisoners and guards and the poor bastard who's taxes have to pay for the guard. Someone has to air-condition the place where they sit, they've got to drive to that crappy job. Someone has to make the bullets they put in those guns. Productivity in the wrong direction is really more costly than people realize. It not that you're wasting your time, it's that you are wasting your time, and you have to invent in your mind what you could have had, and compare the two. Build your own house from scratch, or sit and stare at a guy that got caught smoking weed.

Crime

Part of the reason that there may be less crime and higher qualities of life in northern climates is because the cold causes there to be less catalyst for interaction, and therefore raises the transactional cost for performing any activity. It will amplify activities that human beings consider important, because getting dressed and standing out in the cold during the suck as a transactional friction reduces the amount of risks people will take on things that they are really not that interested. You will probably not get so much vandalism, because trying to be artistic through gloves sucks. Trying to spray paint things that are frozen sucks. When you have a population which is only willing to move and interact under the specific circumstances of gaining entrance to somebody else's property for warmth then you basically amplify the behaviors that humans see value in, and devalue the behaviors that they are not willing to invest in. Like loitering and vandalism etc. I think one of the unexpected side affects of a cold climate; is reduced low value interaction.

R419

Global Politics

Third world

What is this, "third world?" The concept of a third world is a terribly ineffective and outdated way of trying to measure developing nations

R55

Second world

And who the fuck is the second world anyway?

R56

Gain control

We must gain more control over our environment. It is not fair that so many never have the chance at a good life because we have so little mastery of our surroundings.

Many go without food, in the united states your mental health isn't covered by your health insurance. In many countries women have not even the right to drive a car, or to walk alone in the street without the escort of a male family member or husband. In North Korea they are starving and brainwashed and their lot in life hasn't improved in 50 years?

How is it that we find ourselves in this place, where bad people are doing bad things with relative impunity? I would say that it is because we live in a world with limited resources, and that we do not need to live in a world with limited resources. As a matter of fact, one day our resources will be so vast that the problems we will face will look nothing like the problems that we face today. If we get there, and that's a big IF.

National Politics

More at: <http://www.gallup.com/poll/181946/americans-name-government-no-problem.aspx>

Game theory, name the names

The mistake of not naming individual names. The cloak of anonymity that allows people to post absolutely insane trollish and inflammatory comments on internet comments sections all over the internet is the same cloak of anonymity that people in positions of power use to feel more comfortable doing poor jobs, or acting against the best interests of the public, because who really cares, it's not that they personally did it, it's that the "SEC" did it, and what are you going to do now, not invite the SEC over for dinner anymore? The same goes for elections, when they say that the supreme court ruled a certain way on an issue, many news outlets don't go into the detail of which specific justices ruled the specific way and why, which is a shame, because it doesn't take advantage of our human innate desire to be liked by our peers, and therefore to not fuck our peers over too heavily.

Universal Basic Income

Universal income. The robots are coming to take your job. People need a basic fucking income. We need more people, not less, preferably in places where they're going to be educated and not undereducated. We need the population of the planet be ten times longer. We need life spans to be ten times longer. We need [inaudible 114:07.7] to be less. We need research to be more. We need aging defeatism to disappear. You need to do things that scale. Here's why scaling matters: if you don't own a business, you're fucked, and the more of each one of these things we do, the longer, happier, and healthier we will all fucking be. [silence 114:25.2 - 114:32.5] Yeah, we just overly waited it because the conversation - yeah. Yep. [silence 114:38.0 - 115:05.5]

SC1.114

Money corrupting politics

Three solutions

Lawrence Lessig, make the money illegal to give to the politicians. James D'Angelo, cardboard box reform, allow the politicians to lie to the donators about how they'll really vote, and get the money, but actually vote their conscience. This is a secret ballot in practice. I think the secret ballot version isn't as good, because they will still be able to prove how they voted with a secret recording device, or they will be found out to not vote the way they were paid to, by discover 0 people voted for a bill. Or everyone voted for it, or subtracting the total yes or no's from the other known voters who publicly stated how they voted, perhaps under oath, and therefore you can deduce which person it was that lied about how'd they vote for the money. You have the problem of not knowing who you should actually vote for, because they same lies they are telling their funders, are the same lies they will be telling you.

More at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1gEz_sMVaY

Just let it roll and welcome your new corporate overlords. Do it both, disallow the money, and make the voting secret? I haven't looked into this one but it sounds cool.

Pay the elected more to increase the applicant quality. Test to be allowed to vote. Kill first past the post, go Condorcet or closest. Congressional private voting. California massive GDP and population underrepresented in senate.

Lobbyists

[silence 63:46.9 - 63:51.3] Yeah. Right. Like, fuck Northrop Grumman and all the other dudes. They don't know what they're doing. Lockheed Martin? Who's that? Skunk Works? I don't know what you're talking about. Let's go compete with those guys. Northrop Grumman literally spends the most on lobbying with any company the guy states. Literally. I think second place was Comcast. You don't want to compete with those fucking guys. But he's doing it.

SC1.61

Borders

There should be a Miranda Rights for border crossing. Because if you're going to have fair execution of human rights at borders and if you're going to consider borders like 50% of the land mass that contains 50% of the population of the United States then it shouldn't be a constitution free zone, and you should have to Miranda so that people aren't accidentally waving their rights against their own best interest and particularly since this shit is an obvious violation of mass-surveillance treaties that we've signed as parties to the United Nations.

R527

War

The Iraq war, wow that's funny. We sure did bring them some freedom! It's easy to think that the people in charge make good decisions. Sadly this history of the world shows that it's really hard to predict the future, and sometimes the only option you have are bad options. That is part of why the history of the world can be pretty ugly and violent.

I think that in the very old days, if you were (xx true?) that if you voted for war, with your vote you also were enrolled in the war. Therefore voting for it, you also got to participate in it. I think that type of incentive to be as careful with the citizenry's life as you would be with your own, is a good alignment of incentives. If we ended up avoiding too many good wars, I guess we could revisit the issue, so far in the last 20 years or so I don't think we've had too many good wars.

Tragedy

The tragedy of first past the post and gerrymandering. Identify the dumb assessment that were wrong and make them feel bad for being wrong. If you are wrong more than you are right please shut the fuck up. The failure of the congressional and other voting system due to non-private ballots. Emergent properties that look like collusion. Separation of government and currency. Governments have found a solution to tragedy of the commons problem through straight up taking your money off the bat and doing whatever they want with it.

They don't have to ask you what you will let them do with your money, they just take it, and do what they please with it. Sometimes they do things you don't want them to do, like move rocks around in faraway places with no tangible benefit to you at all. Sometimes you might get a road out of the deal. It would probably be nice if you had some say in what your money went towards, perhaps every citizen could assign values to the uses of their taxes that matched their morals. There would be some people that want more defense spending, some people less. Some that want more education spending, some less. Should not the desires of the taxed be represented? I've heard

that long ago some pretty cool dudes thought that taxation without representation was not fair. They went to war over it and we ended up with the United States of America.

In the digital and connected world that we now live in, can we really believe that the desires of the taxed can be best guessed at by the elected officials? How about you give me a fucking phone app that I can use to straight up tell you what I want my money spent on. Then when you ignore my requests, you won't be able to pretend that you didn't know.

The people who really need the government resources

And then, you don't have to have Congress declare war. You just let the President do it whenever he wants. That's two great ways to be at war more often when it is not necessary. It doesn't just cost money, it costs human lives. Like, the highest cause of death for the Armed Services, by the way, is suicide. Yeah. The most number of United States military personnel that will die this year will die from killing themselves. Maybe some money should get spent on that. The homeless people in the United States? The amount of mental illness? Holy fuck, it's high. Did you know when you get health insurance, it doesn't cover mental illness? It's not considered health somehow. Yeah. Maybe that should get fixed. I didn't know that either, and my mother has schizophrenia, and like, real deal schizophrenia. Like, take your meds. Well, not on a private insurance policy, no. Any insurance policy you can buy; they don't count that.

SC1.44

Decision making

Horrible government shit

License plate tracking

Meta data

John Oliver

Debtors prison

Driving prison

Speeding tickets in TX cached and undelivered for months, so as to rack up huge penalties

Male vs female sentencing

Effect of having eaten or being on period, or time of day on sentencing harshness (this is an actual study re after lunch sentencing) why wouldn't the obvious satiation and satisfaction of a human affect their decision making and desire to affect retributive sentences on other humans.

The effect of women in government

<http://static4.fjcdn.com/comments/3772514+f62152ec1304ab91343a8eb3296da665.jpg>

"Frivolity is the frequent companion of pessimism. Let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die. The resemblance between various declining nations in this respect is truly surprising. The Roman mob, we have seen, demanded free meals and public games. Gladiatorial shows, chariot races and athletic events were their passion. In the Byzantine Empire the rivalries of the Greens and the Blues in the hippodrome attained the importance of a major crisis.

Judging by the time and space allotted to them in the Press and television, football and baseball are the activities which today chiefly interest the public in Britain and the United States respectively.

The heroes of declining nations are always the same — the athlete, the singer or the actor. The word 'celebrity' today is used to designate a comedian or a football player, not a statesman, a general, or a literary genius."

From <http://www.isegoria.net/2014/07/frivolity/>

The problems in this above text are the hero worship can only occur when the heroism is understood and as the activity goes outside the understanding of the common man, it is unrewardable by the common man, only the status, not the action, thus I believe these deficiencies exist in all cultures, not only those judged to be declining. Also the mobs didn't demand the free shit, it was freely given by artificially powerful and greedy for votes and other malintented outcomes.. This you see is the reason that the text regard the refreshing democracy with the blood of patriots and tyrants was issued.

And what country can preserve it's liberties if their rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, pardon and pacify them. What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The **tree of liberty** must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is it's natural manure. Our Convention has been too much impressed by the insurrection of Massachusetts: and in the spur of the moment they are setting up a kite to keep the hen yard in order. I hope in god this article will be rectified before the new constitution is accepted." - [Thomas Jefferson](#) to William Stephens Smith, [Paris](#), 13 Nov. 1787[2]

From <[<http://wiki.monticello.org/mediawiki/index.php/The_tree_of_liberty...\(Quotation\)>](http://wiki.monticello.org/mediawiki/index.php/The_tree_of_liberty...(Quotation))>

"A Democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of Government. It can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largess of the public treasury. From that moment on the majority always votes for the candidate promising the most benefits from the public treasury with the result that Democracy always collapses over a loose fiscal policy..."
Professor Alexander Fraser Tyler writing when the states were still colonies of Great Britain, explaining why democracies always fail.

From <<http://foundationfortruthinlaw.org/quotes.html>>

"If Congress can employ money indefinitely to the general welfare, and are the sole and supreme judges of the general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their own hands; they may appoint teachers in every State, county and parish and pay them out of their public treasury; they may take into their own hands the education of children, establishing in like manner schools throughout the Union; they may assume the provision of the poor; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post-roads; in short, everything, from the highest object of state legislation down to the most minute object of police, would be thrown under the power of Congress....Were the power of Congress to be established in the latitude contended for, it would subvert the very foundations, and transmute the very nature of the limited Government established by the people of America." -- James Madison (1751-1836), Father of the Constitution for the USA, 4th US President Source: referring to a bill to subsidize cod fisherman introduced in the first year of the new Congress.

From <<http://foundationfortruthinlaw.org/quotes.html>>

"A nation can survive its fools, and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treason from within. An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and carries his banner openly. But the traitor moves amongst those within the gate freely, his sly whispers rustling through all the alleys, heard in the very halls of government itself. For the traitor appears not a traitor; he speaks in accents familiar to his victims, and he wears their face and their arguments, he appeals to the baseness that lies deep in the hearts of all men. He rots the soul of a nation, he works secretly and unknown in the night to undermine the pillars of the city, he infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to fear." ---

<http://foundationfortruthinlaw.org/quotes.html>

Christianity^[edit]

See also: [Christian ethics](#)

According to [Simon Blackburn](#), although the Golden Rule "can be found in some form in almost every ethical tradition", the rule is "sometimes claimed by Christianity as its own".^[28] The "Golden Rule" has been attributed to [Jesus of Nazareth](#), who used it to summarize the [Torah](#): "Do to others what you want them to do to you. This is the meaning of the law of Moses and the teaching of the prophets"^[29] ([Matthew 7:12 NCV](#), see also [Luke 6:31](#)). The common English phrasing is "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you". A similar form appeared in a Catholic [catechism](#) around 1567 (certainly in the reprint of 1583).^[30] The Golden Rule is stated positively numerous times in the Hebrew Pentateuch as well as the Prophets and Writings. [Leviticus 19:18](#) ("Forget about the wrong things people do to you, and do not try to get even. Love your neighbor as you love yourself."; see also [Great Commandment](#)) and [Leviticus 19:34](#) ("But treat them just as you treat your own citizens. Love foreigners as you love yourselves, because you were foreigners one time in Egypt. I am the Lord your God.").

The [Old Testament Deuterocanonical](#) books of [Tobit](#) and [Sirach](#), accepted as part of the Scriptural canon by [Catholic Church](#), [Eastern Orthodoxy](#), and the [Non-Chalcedonian](#) Churches, express a negative form of the golden rule:

"Do to no one what you yourself dislike."

— Tobit 4:15

"Recognize that your neighbor feels as you do, and keep in mind your own dislikes."

— Sirach 31:15

At the time of [Hillel](#), an elder contemporary of Jesus of Nazareth, the negative form of the golden rule was already proverbial among Second Temple Jews. When asked to sum up the entire Torah concisely, he answered:

"That which is hateful to you, do not do to your fellow. That is the whole Torah; the rest is the explanation; go and learn."

— Talmud, *Shabbat* 31a

Two passages in the [New Testament](#) quote [Jesus of Nazareth](#) espousing the positive form of the rule:

[Matthew 7:12](#)

Do to others what you want them to do to you. This is the meaning of the law of Moses and the teaching of the prophets.

[Luke 6:31](#)

Do to others what you would want them to do to you.

A similar passage, a parallel to the [Great Commandment](#), is [Luke 10:25-28](#)

²⁵And one day an authority on the law stood up to put Jesus to the test. "Teacher," he asked, "what must I do to receive eternal life?"

²⁶What is written in the Law?" Jesus replied. "How do you understand it?" ²⁷He answered, " 'Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Love him with all your strength and with all your mind.' (Deuteronomy 6:5) And, 'Love your neighbor as you love yourself.' " ²⁸"You have answered correctly," Jesus replied. "Do that, and you will live."

The passage in the book of Luke then continues with Jesus answering the question, "Who is my neighbor?", by telling the parable of the [Good Samaritan](#), indicating that "your neighbor" is anyone in need.^[31] This extends to all, including those who are generally considered hostile. Jesus' teaching goes beyond the negative formulation of not doing what one would not like done to themselves, to the positive formulation of actively doing good to another that, if the situations were reversed, one would desire that the other would do for them. This formulation, as indicated in the parable of the Good Samaritan, emphasizes the needs for positive action that brings benefit to another, not simply restraining oneself from negative activities that hurt

another. Taken as a rule of judgment, both formulations of the golden rule, the negative and positive, are equally applicable.^[32]

In one passage of the [New Testament Paul the Apostle](#) refers to the golden rule:
[Galatians 5:14](#)

¹⁴For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

From <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Golden_Rule>

Something similar in idea, but very different is that pay onto Caesar what is Caesars, or to that effect, allowed Christians to avoid lots of conflict.)

Class war



The PRESS branch of government

How can you do your job as a voter properly when the 4th branch of government, the press, is lying to you by legal decree, say in Europe, where the faces of criminals are not only blurred out, but colored white, to help out the brown minorities shirk responsibility and place it on white people? Perhaps blue tint would be better because we don't have blue people to worry about taking the blame.

Environment

Vinay Gupta is pretty fucking awesome

Politically empowering engineers instead of the political class:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=glfVklGnwck&ebc=ANyPxKo8mu9yhqz3yIPvdXJvbj53bysoA6bzR4CtYahR0tNV3zkGP3un4ms89S3kCQsalk5uxd2r828MyeHfHr2d9lUDwhZYQ)

[v=glfVklGnwck&ebc=ANyPxKo8mu9yhqz3yIPvdXJvbj53bysoA6](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=glfVklGnwck&ebc=ANyPxKo8mu9yhqz3yIPvdXJvbj53bysoA6bzR4CtYahR0tNV3zkGP3un4ms89S3kCQsalk5uxd2r828MyeHfHr2d9lUDwhZYQ)

[bzR4CtYahR0tNV3zkGP3un4ms89S3kCQsalk5uxd2r828MyeHfHr2d9lUDwhZYQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=glfVklGnwck&ebc=ANyPxKo8mu9yhqz3yIPvdXJvbj53bysoA6bzR4CtYahR0tNV3zkGP3un4ms89S3kCQsalk5uxd2r828MyeHfHr2d9lUDwhZYQ)

Car accidents are deadly

20M injuries per year people under 34 leading cause of death is car accidents, LA is half parking lots and roads, seems like a waste of space, (this is from Larry Page ted talk on mar 21, 2014 with Charlie Rose. Is this accurate what he's saying (need to put that chart in there from the data is beautiful subreddits where it shows a wave looking graph over stuff that is going to kill you over time, and you can see the shapes of the multicolored wave change as you age. Fuck age by the way :(- age not cool.

Quality of life index by temperature

More at:

https://www.reddit.com/r/dataisbeautiful/comments/3yoaxk/deciding_where_i_want_to_live_when_i_discovered/

Self-driving cars

Improve the roads and get self-driving cars to work easier by getting RFID signaling out on all the roads, could perhaps use some GPS encoding against a private key for a car to know that it's not being lied to about a placed marker. Or the markers could hash chain each other and alert when there's a break in the chain.



Temperature vs standard of living. Correlation, Location

More at:

https://www.reddit.com/r/dataisbeautiful/comments/3yoaxk/deciding_where_i_want_to_live_when_i_discovered/

Possibility

There's a possibility that many of the world's problems get solved purely by distance and crowding. You know if you see someone starving in the street, you're much more likely to help them out than someone that's in the middle of nowhere that you're only aware of because some other person that's nowhere near them televised it and brought it to you on television or radio or print.

R246

Housing

Housing costs are impossible

Include the part where if you save a hundred thousand euros for 20 years you still can't afford a house that cost 2k / sq. ft. for 2 mill euros because the house keeps going up in price and who do you know that could save a hundred thousand euros in 20 years AFTER taxes.

R44

Housing. If the S&P Five Hundred [S&P 500] and all of the companies doing research, development, working for efficiency, and new and never before seen industries doesn't outperform housing, which has existed in more or less the same format for at least a hundred years, then there's something with the world. When the housing market increases in value, it means that the newest people that are born and just came out of high school will never, ever, ever be able to ever own a house, ever, unless they beg their corporate or government overlords to buy it for them and let them work it off. And in order to do that, they have to pay a huge transactional cost to get in, a huge transactional cost to get out, government mandate insurance, or at least mortgage company mandated insurance, or else they won't allow you to have a mortgage. You must insure [?] that they will take from you when you can no longer pay the bills. What's that? Housing prices have gone down? Uh oh! The economy's gone shitty?

You lose your job, you can't pay your rent anymore? Well, I guess you can sell your house and pay the bank back. Oh shit! Because you lost your job for the same reason everyone else lost their job, the housing market's fucked, nobody's buying houses. If they are buying houses, they're buying them for far less than they did, and so now when you liquidate your house, which you will be forced to do when they foreclose on you, to attempt to pay back some of the debt that you own the bank, you're fucked! You're in debt! Because, you lost your job, and the housing market was correlated with your job, and therefore, when the worst case scenario happens, and you lose your job due to the economy, the thing that's supposed to be there to save you, the equity that you have in your house, disappears at the same time.

You're not hedged. You don't have your investment, and something that will save you when you need it the most, you're amplifying your risk. When you are most likely to have a job, then people are also most likely to have their jobs, and then the housing prices are high as fuck. When you lose yours and they lose theirs, everyone's more fucked, amplifying the boom bust cycle. Therefore I would say that if you want human beings to be able to own homes without corporate overlords, government overlords, then the homes must be affordable.

A bunch of assholes trying to move into the same place and buy the same home, instead of spreading out a little bit, is stupid. Furthermore, the housing industry hasn't had any progress in a hundred years, nor is it likely to be expected to until very strong robots can start stacking bricks on their own, which we're not at yet. Right? Even if we do get there, it's not because the fucking housing market allowed it to happen. It's because of people that are currently in the S&P Five Hundred, the actual businesses out there, learning, building, experimenting, becoming more efficient, those fuckin' people that actually making a world a better place, those people allowed the robots to do those things.

If the housing market ever gets better, it's because everyone else but the housing market fucking allowed it to do so. I do not believe in real estate investment. I do not believe in the transactional, and I'm a licensed mortgage broker, I own a mortgage company. I do not believe in a transactional cost, and the bid ask spreads that go when you want to get in or out of a property. I do not believe in the maintenance and upkeep cost. The risk of civil asset forfeiture and acts of God, that, you know, hey your house gets fucked up, but magically, your insurance policy can wiggle out of it? Oh well, all gone.

Oh, I thought I was covered for that. No, no, you were just ten feet out of the flood zone. You know, sorry, you know, we didn't sell that insurance deposit to you, we didn't think you needed it. Fuck you. Right? So, when you buy the S&P Five Hundred, what's your bid ask spread? Nothing. What's your liquidity? Sell anytime you want. What's your capital gains benefit? All you want. Right? Can you get loans against that? Sure. What do you pay to get a loan against your stock portfolio? Well, not that much, transactionally. What do you pay to get a loan against your house? Refinance? Oh shit, boy, we're going to get a lot of money. xx, someone should check to see if some new derivative investment [unclear 00:04:14] things exist.

I'm not an expert on personal loans against assets. My point is, the business of the world, many of which are probably traded, is creating what the future looks like. The housing market is doing the opposite of creating what the future looks like. It's sucking up capital, and amplifying the boom-bust cycle, and fucking everyone over. More money should go into companies building the future, than into the people hoarding the past and hoarding the "I must live here, this is rare, only one exists" bullshit human emotion of scarcity, when there's a lot of land that can be made great. If less people would have that stupid idea that they got to in that single one spot, then we could have a lot of really cool other places. Right? But instead, we just buy into diminishing returns in the same place. Fuck real estate investment, fuck transactional costs, fuck upkeep, and fuck historically low returns compared to the stock market. Stocks, yes. Real estate, no.

R618

Hexayurt

Kill the mortgage

Remote work

Productivity in self driving cars

People

That are actually working on shit

What do you think has done more for sprinting logic, Sherlock Home or books from Burch and Russell; that no one has ever read?

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Breakthrough_Prize_in_Life_Sciences

<https://breakthroughprize.org/>

<https://www.fightaging.org/archives/2014/03/genetics-and-aging-venture-human-longevity-launched.php>

<http://www.humanlongevity.com/>

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SENS_Research_Foundation

<http://www.gizmodo.com.au/2015/02/anti-aging-experts-made-a-million-dollar-bet-on-who-dies-last/>

R338

Transhumanist

I don't identify as a transhumanist. How fucking stupid is that? [inaudible 111:27.6] like, transcend humanity? How about we just get humanity right first? How about we do at least, like, even be human properly first before we talk about beating it. Let's try actually doing humanity right before we try to quote transcendent, which by the way, as far as I'm concerned, is just about to destroy it. Maybe you're okay with whatever shows up after. Maybe it shows up after it's better, but if you transcend humanity, you definitely aren't human anymore. You're basically an alien at that point. Fuck futurism. Fuck transhumanism. Fuck immoralists. You can't identify with these shitty terms. They're not actionable. They're too hard to understand. They're full of shit. They're often wrong. Like, fuck that noise.

SC1.112

Special People

Planetary redundancy vs Longevity

Elon's strategy is planetary redundancy. That doesn't work for me. I care more about my life and my loved ones' lives. We don't want to work on just this one issue. I think this is a Warren Buffet quote: "Some people say don't put all your eggs in one basket". We say put all your eggs in one basket and watch it very carefully. And then see what works better.

SC1.26

Paths to Longevity

Well, some people respond to fear, some people respond to hope, some people respond to competition, some people like - there's a shitload of different ways to get there, but they are finite, right? Someone should try them. There is no investment in longevity research or investment in this fucking startup that is awesome and you're going to make lots of money, oh, and by the way, it also has side effects. Is this longevity [inaudible 87:38.4]? Like, no one's doing. There's no TV ads, there's no newspaper ads. There ain't shit going on. And it's not wacky, it's like, the money is out there. Google Calico people, they're working on aging. [silence 87:55.3 - 88:04.4]

SC1.86

Bill Liao

I've got a good friend Bill, who also started numerous charities. I met him when we both were working as photographers. He is on my list of heroes, too. Bill started CoderDojo, a platform teaching kids to code. He started WeForest.com that plants trees. He is living the life I should be living. He makes an impact on people's minds or at least he is doing his best to achieve that. In addition, Bill has a good synthetic biology startup accelerator. He is a freak, you know what I am talking about! Bill Leo is like William Lee, you can see him on Wikipedia as well as you can search for him on TEDx. I was going to have a talk with Bill about his book, but he did not have time. We are going to do that later on, after I talk to other two heroes who come up on top of my head: Larry Page who along with Google started a project called Calico – it is a zombie direction inaudible fix of everything.

SC1.13

Christopher Hitchens

Quoted someone else saying that "for bad men to do bad things is quite simple, but to get a good man to do bad things, you really need religion".

Larry Page

What are the themes that we've got? There are some people out there doing some cool stuff. Google started Calico, the anti-aging thing. They were late as fuck to do it, but at least they're trying to do something now. Larry Page is working on it. He's doing some moon shot shit. Elon Musk is doing moon shot shit. Some of it may amplify the world's progress, like his global satellite system that will get Internet everywhere? Well, that's a core component of getting cryptocurrency everywhere, right? Because money is communication, and communication requires a network, and we don't have Internet everywhere in the world right now.

SC1.42

SC1.65 Horowitz, Wilson, Thiel

So you don't have to - and by the way, if you listen to what everyone says, everybody that is among this hero list of VC guys, right? They all basically say that some permutation of this - by synthetic biology, bio tech stuff, right? Some guys are on the Bitcoin train, so Ben Horowitz, Fred Wilson, Peter Thiel. Cryptocurrency and synthetic biology is where these guys are focused. That's the next fucking thing. And basically Ben Horowitz said where biology meets technology. It was his particular way of putting that. It's not a mistake. It's not a mistake that we're all ending up here. Larry Page has got a foundation. Peter Thiel's got a foundation. They're both working on anti-aging. The United States actually has a national institute of aging. I think it's called the NIA, I believe?

SC1.60 The power of one guy with a dream (Elon Musk)

So, let's take Tesla as an example. Tesla makes badass electric cars. Best the world's ever seen. Where did that come from? Well, it took one guy with a fucking dream, and then he hit the streets and generated the money and the buzz, and then did it. Now would Tesla exist without that one guy? In that case, I would say no. [silence 63:13.1 - 63:24.8] Right. Yep, that sounds right to me. I mean, he says like, "Yeah, if you make a list of like the risk adjusted return on investment, these are at the bottom of the list. You want to start a car company?" "You're going to fail. You want to start a rocket company? You're really going to fail."

Elon musk gamification of education

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vDwzmJpl4io> 36:20s lol at 37 he agrees with my education stance

SC1.12- Aubrey is a Hero

I think, Aubrey is a hero, and I do not use this term lightly. He used to be a computer scientist in Cambridge; also, he has a PhD in biology that he got without attending any classes. Biology was just a hobby for him at first, but later he decided he wanted to take up biology seriously. He figured out why mitochondria ruined, no one knew why it happened before. Free radical theories did not help to understand this process. Anyway, he figured it out, wrote a thesis about it and defended it in Cambridge that is how he got his PhD. It is a great way to obtain such a degree, no need to attend any courses and just figure out something that nobody could do before. Then he started the Sense Foundation that became his life's mission. He got an inheritance when his mother died, something about 8 or 10 million, he donated 6 million to the foundation. Peter Thiel gave about 6 - 10 million to this charity.

SC1.88- Bill gates Giving Pledge

So Bill Gates, richest guy in the world, right? How much money does he spend? How much time does he spend trying to get other people's money? To go the same places that he is? Quite a bit. Quite a bit, yeah. So he started something called The Giving

Pledge or something, where he like recruited and invited and met with and pitched other billionaires to give away their fortunes. And went out and like, was successful. Okay? If it's good enough for Bill fucking Gates to spend money on marketing than personal time un-marketing to get other people to do shit, then it's surely useful for everyone else. Because he's got the most money. But even with the most, he still needs other people's help.

SC1.95 Methuselah Foundation

The Methuselah Foundation is a 300 Club. Now why is the Methuselah Foundation called Methuselah? Because a lot of these religious folks think that you should die earlier because it's God's plan. I mean, you're like, "Hey, but what about Methuselah? Apparently this was cool way back when." [inaudible 97:47.6] remind them for the Bible freaks, like, "Hey, we used to be able to live long. It's cool." "Oh, okay. It's cool. It's cool then." So then there was like - so the guy that started the Methuselah Foundation also started the [inaudible 98:02.9], and the [inaudible 98:04.1] was how you get rewarded financially for making older mice. It's a good fucking idea. It's going to happen to mice before it happens to people. But the funding was always pretty shit.

SC1.64 You don't have to be charitable to support these causes

[silence 66:32.0 - 66:43.4] Right. Yeah, and you know what, dude? You can't do it for free, man. You can go invest in certain startups that have a certain flavor, and go get fucking rich. Because let me tell you, if you knew how much women spent on anti-aging face cream, it'd shock you. Apparently, people don't like looking old. They probably like being old slightly less. How much would someone pay to be able to fix their face collagen? \$50 billion? \$100 billion? Easily? That's a big goddamn market. You don't have to be charitable to support these things. Elon Musk was charitable, but that motherfucker's rolling in money right now, isn't he? Well, it turns out that sometimes doing the good thing that's being underdone is worth a shitload of money.

Competes with bill?

<http://www.viagroforestry.org/what-we-do/agroforestry/>

People who love equality

147. People love equality except, well, they have weight classes in boxing and all other sports; and the male and female bathrooms are always different, but only have one bathroom. Because no one wants to hear the other party's ripping ass is my belief; also girl's bathrooms should just be bigger because they take longer

Generous People

506. Because my father gave so much to everyone else, he didn't have anything to give me. I had to go to the stingy guy, and he wouldn't give anything else to anyone else because he had some that he could give to me. So I say that compassion is a privilege of the penniless.

QR

Amazingly well rounded people

You know the reason that you look out into the world, and you can't name so many people that have an amazing body and amazing health and, uh, no drug problems and a family that loves them and are rich and are happy – rich, happy, fit, uh, loved – it seems to be not an easy thing to achieve. If you take, uh, you know if you take a great beach body, which I guess with all the steroids and amazing diets that are out there in the world you could say would involve a six-pack if you're a guy, uh, those are fancy strong looking abdomens with no fat, for those that don't know what a six-pack is, and, uh, for women, I'm not sure. I guess, uh, a nice line down the middle of, uh, of the center of your stomach perhaps? Also barely any fat once again, because fat, I tell you, is just not popular. I don't even like it. So, I, you know, I don't think that's very rare to dislike fat because you'd be hard pressed to find many fat people on the covers of any magazines of any sort. Hell, I wouldn't be surprised if there was a magazine called "Fat Persons Weekly," and they never put a fat person on the front, because, uh, no one would buy the damn thing.

Now the reason I mention that when you look out into the wild, you see barely any instance of a person that has all of these traits, then why would they be so rare? Well, because they are at odds with what we have been programmed for, you know, the many, many, many thousands of years before language even existed and before cities even existed. Calories were really rare, and priding yourself on having the absolute minimum number of calories available to you to keep you alive during a period of hardship, uh, is exactly the opposite of what we're programmed to do. Uh, we're not made to burn the maximum number of calories with a minimum amount of safety. It takes a lot of effort, uh, to do that unless, I guess, you're some kind of mutant. And the same type of conservation of energy that we perform in regards to our diet, uh, consequently we also perform in regards to our activity, because way back when, before cities and language, doing anything could be considered a risk. You could go to a new place – animal eats you. You go to a new place – other human being kills you, considers you a threat to its food source. You go to another place – uh, a rock falls on your head.

Even going other places was dangerous, and even if those other places weren't dangerous, they, uh, very likely would require expenditure, energy, to get there. You know, bears actually hibernate in the winter. Uh, you know, mammals and lots of other creatures sleep. We have down times where we're not active because, hey, we did what we needed to do while we were active, so let's sleep and rest like, uh, a well-programmed cell phone that wants to survive on its battery for longer, and, uh, you know, not be active all the time. So we have a conservation of energy in our diet and we have a conservation of energy in our movement and behavior, and these are the reasons that you don't see very many super hyper, productive people, because that type of productivity we value is as a culture. However, evolutionarily, uh, it was more harm than good way back when, because when you hit that limit that you weren't expecting – the calorie limit – you just die. There's nothing you can do.

Now, enough people that were members of the tribe, uh, needed to be adventurous and needed to perform those, uh, those extra-caloric intensive activities of, you know, traveling to new places, and, uh, you know that's part of what curiosity is. We want to see what's over there, you know? Maybe there's something awesome over there. And so there's this tension, there's this balance between conserving energy and finding new awesome resources. And it's not just new resources that are physical in the real world, but mental ones as well, because there's always a better way to understand the thing. There's always a, uh, a better, uh, thing that can be learned, so to speak. And that progress, you know, led to tools, and led to language, and writing, and city-states, and, you know, now we have nation-states. So, I think that when you are feeling guilty that you haven't had the type of progress and production that you think is possible in your life, uh, it definitely is possible.

However, unless you're some lucky mutant, you are going to need to bust your ass and use your brain, uh, the right way, and use your thought the right way, and schedule the right things, uh, and you know, either have the world's best discipline, or be a lucky mutant or understand that, you know, it's a fight and it's a battle. And, you know, there's a reason there's one Michael Jordan and, you know, one, uh, Mike Tyson. It's not remotely possible for most people to ever, regardless of effort, obtain those levels. It seems that, um, similar to those behaviors – having a six-pack, love, riches, happiness and fulfillment – is a similar level of difficulty, maybe slightly less. And so when you...you might be able to take good advice from someone who doesn't have some of those traits, because their advice could be fabulous. They're just missing one other key component they might need, like, uh, insane dedication, right?

Or a value and belief system that lead them to believing, you know, that only strict productivity and fitness was useful. Whereas, uh, what you could consider productivity in gluttony was not useful. But as someone that has been a glutton I can tell you, it feels pretty great. And it feels pretty useful when you're doing it. And so, uh, it in a well-functioning human being, you could make the statement that hedonism and gluttony, uh, are awesome behaviors if you're going to have a short life anyway. If you're going to get hit by a bus tomorrow, I would suggest that you not consider yourself with your diet and your last day on earth. And, you know, this person that's trying to help you will get what they want out of life. I hope that I'm not, uh, the advertisement for hedonism and gluttony. However, let's now pretend that they don't have value.

Vanity & Muscular guys

Hard work?

I like anytime people see truly muscular dudes, especially ones that put it on quick and they go, "Aw, well, it's just hard work," and you're trying to tear them down by saying stories. Okay, well, sure. Maybe that guy's not on steroids, but let me ask you a question. You look at the sales numbers for the fucking steroid company and you see their selling billions and zillions and billions of units, who the fuck do you think is taking those? The midgets you see walking around?

R243

Vanity is the power everyone else has over you

He really wants - he thinks we're going to have a cancer cure in the next 20 years. And so, he's doing things like, you know, he's taking some HGH stuff that increases muscle mass. I think it's because his vanity. It's my personal opinion, which I don't mind at all. Vanity, cool. That's the power the rest of the world has over you. But people think that's their power. It's actually reversed. Vanity is the power that the rest of the world has over you. A lot of people try so hard to be important, and they think it makes them more powerful. But in fact it makes them less powerful. Everybody else makes the decision, not you. But people think that's their power. It's actually reversed. Vanity is the power that the rest of the world has over you. A lot of people try so hard to be important, and they think it makes them more powerful. But in fact it makes them less powerful. Everybody else makes the decision, not you.

SC1.25

Testing People

I think unreasonable unfair tests for particularly greedy and jealous self-serving motives that don't help the other party should be considered punishable and as a tax. The same way that if you drive recklessly on the road and you endanger other people's lives. Well you may not have heard anyone this time but we understand that behavior is so damaging and harmful and potentially dangerous. There we have to punish you pretty heavily because that's the only way for us to reduce that super dangerous behavior. I would be willing to state that the financial and social penalties that exist for risky low reward high potential damage things that exist in the criminal world perhaps should exist in the social world. Maybe that's why guys and girls react so violently when they discover their partner was cheating. Because unlike a biological respective in the old days before genetic testing.

If a woman had a kid and that kid wasn't yours but you thought it was now, you are permanently eliminated from the gene pool of the future of humanity. Unless you have another kid with her that just happens to be yours or you have another partner or you donate sperm to a sperm bank and someone actually uses it. Unless those three options become true, you are permanently eliminated from the gene pool. And so we have a evolved and been rewarded for being violently pair blondish and literally violently, like injure the other party violently defensive of a pair bond between two lovers. Because perhaps those people that were cool with you know polygamy just got opted out of survival. They didn't end up having enough kids of their own. Then after time passed the people that

had a more effective strategy for promoting their genes into the future by having partners that were monogamous with them or I guess that would be another strategy you could be the guy that gets all the girls to cheat with you.

I guess you could do that too. I can't remember what they call, guys that have that is like a thing they like to do baby makers or something. What are the recent discoveries? One, testing, stress testing exists based on biological design. It has sociologically beneficial consequences. Some negatives but some upsides too. Two, knowing that allows you to have a better life. Three, the better life that you have is from executing reasonable tasks where they fit and understanding what other people are testing. If they don't understand they really are or not whether it's an unconscious motive or a conscious motive. Next discovery, testing is harmful to the other party. I don't think that that's widely recognized. Next issue, your amount of value you get from implementing tests has to do more with what options you have upon a failure of the test. Than it does, you know with almost anything else.

We throw in a side note there about the frequency at which you do these measurements. I think that the whole knowing yourself and knowing what you really want makes you a better partners in knowing what makes something desirable and good in that other person that awareness probably makes a lot easier for you to do this things. Because if you know what excellence looks like when they do it you have a chance of having that excellent output on your own. Whereas if you don't know what you're looking for in them how the hell would you know what you're supposed to do. And if you did know what you're supposed to do when you obviously look for it in them.

I think people that know what they want in a partner are much more likely to be good partners themselves. And the failure the final one was. Test can be so harmful that they should be penalized. Then you'll see this. Socially if you see somebody tested you like they pretended like they were pregnant when they really want to see what your response was you find out they did that you can harm them where we found out they were flirting with some guy and like cheating on you like. You know getting some extra pee in them that they shouldn't. Boy you know you're going to feel obligated to socially punish that person. As a first response, maybe you found a superior intellectual way to handle that but as a first emotional response you're kind of designed to respond to tit for tat for that kind of violation. And then the other learning in discovery from this was that you know, if you're applying a test a whole lot of people are employing a whole lot of people to do a thing.

That is also kind of not fair. And that you know how many people you need to cook a steak. If ten guys come into a room and each one of them blows hot air on the steak how many people can blow until it's cooked? Never because fifty people blowing hot air on a steak doesn't cook it. You need one guy and some real heat. That's much hotter than what humans can generate without mechanical systems. So it's the same way with some tasks in the world. They don't need to be turned into competition is that waste lots of people to time. And that's basically you could say that that competition is kind of a test. It's just in this test. Pass is to beat all the other applicants that as well.

You don't have to pass like a ninety percent. You have to pass. The other top grades you have to be the top grade that's kind of a crappy test. I guess you could call it like not collective waste but you call it over allocation of resources towards a goal where only one person gets to win. There's some things in life where everyone that competes that reaches a certain level of goodness get something beneficial out of there are other things in life where like the lottery where everyone that competes gets pure loss and pure sock and pure missing money. You know minus the fun gambling addiction fulfillment feelings which I try to like minimize as that anyone should. You know look for if you want to fill that need find a

way to do it the cost less money, if you can. So in a lottery, you know almost everyone loses. One guy gets to win. Well a lot of people wasted a lot of time picking number buying tickets misallocating resources rewarding a terrible idea. Oh! Here's a terrible idea.

You know, let's penalize stupid people that are bad at statistics or don't have good emotional balance where they can you know control short term response for long term gain. I won't risk this short term money for giant possible reward. Even though mathematically I lose half of every dollar I spend. You know you shouldn't reward industries that prey upon and amplify and market into the world negative outcomes for everyone that is exposed to those ads. If a certain portion of people see an ad for a lottery. Follow the suggestion and buy lottery tickets then to some degree every advertising dollar that they spend that they got from some other player. They are harming the world. You now so you want to see more about how you shouldn't reward people for doing harm through marketing, check out the marketing is pollution chapter in this book.

R320 & QE.320

Musicians

I don't know whether put this in the book or not but if your musician, and the only way that you can make money is on tour people that are on tour don't write new good music. The great music that you're going to appreciate the most and has a longest lasting value probably got created in a studio. If you're drunk and hung over and on an airplane and trying to get to the next place, you're obviously not in the studio. I would like to see people be more reasonable with how much time they spent on the road and create better music. Then be unreasonable, go get super-duper Megan sandwich by doing live shows at the cost of lifetime productivity. Because they reduce the amount of time that they had in their entire life to produce great music and instead traded it for you know, doing the same thing over and over and over again but in a different city.

R330

Racism

I think much of racism is a class problem more so than it is a race problem. A lot of the times when people imagine what members of another race are like it's usually restricted to a class that's the most well marketed. If they got to experience the other high class versions of those races, they'd probably have a greatly different opinion.

R369

Women

I think part of the reason girls talk like girls because if they talked like guys then they might get treated like guys and that would be disadvantageous for them.

R575

Sexual Stereotypes

Sexual stereotypes exist! Millions of dollars have been spent to make certain ways of looking and acting better than others! You got to ride that wave! If millions of dollars get spent making Justin Bieber's fucked up haircut look good, you need to have that haircut, my dog.

People will value stuff they already agree with

What does the world look like? Now, here's the funny thing, right? So let's talk about - so let's take Peter Thiel's thing of his important contrarian thing, which might even sell books. Like, I think he can make outrageous claims without being contrarian. I think that you can - let me rephrase that. I believe that a human being will value reading shit that they already agree with. And I think that that is the common factor. If you're Christian, you're going to read books about Christ. When you pick up a book about Buddhism, that's a rare event. If you're Christian, you're going to go to Church and hear more about the shit you already believe in. You're not going to go hear about something different. If you're a Republican, you're going to watch the fucking news, and you're a fucking hate MSNBC.

SC1.51

People are unlikely to donate to charity

This would be probably easier to look up than to strategize about. I don't believe that there's enough people giving, and especially business people. Like, "why would I give to charity? I'm trying to make my next deal! Give to charity, what are you talking about? Give to charity, I'm giving to a charity, it's called my Lexus." So like, yeah. I think a lot more people are interested in self-interest than they are in helping people they'll never ever meet. And actually probably wouldn't want to meet. Like, "Damn, you smell, dude. Get the fuck out of here." How much more money - go ahead. [silence 93:34.7 - 94:09.7] Yeah. You know what? I think I figured out a solution for this shit. Fuck... I hate it when I think of something that counter-indicates my example.

SC1.90

Internet tough guys

The internet is a funny place, loser there project that a pretty woman would reject their disgusting ass on sight, and thus without ever interacting with them at all, set out to destroy their life, I imagine funnily because they hate them, and feel that by causing them pain, somehow they're less of a loser. I guess it's the execution of tit for tat strategy, however they imagined the first tat, it never happened. Dick heads. As is a common saying, "this is why we can't have nice things". You can't put your address or phone number on the internet with a petty picture of yourself If you're a woman, because some useless piece of shit is going to punish you for it. As is a common saying, "this is why we can't have nice things". You can't put your address or phone number on the internet with a petty picture of yourself If you're a woman, because some useless piece of shit is going to punish you for it.

Smart / Wrong / Not smart People

Smarter people

I wonder if you measured the electrical heat or rather just the heat output of smarter people, if they just ran at a higher idle speed therefore consumed more energy in their brains. If you could measure that somehow. Maybe like an efficient CPU, they're actually faster and generate less waste heat if they're better designed, or have a smaller process node size.

The most effective or wealthy people are rarely the smartest

The least useful

The least useful people are at the end points. People who don't know that they should or are already at where they want to be.

What makes people wealthy are rarely the smartest things they know

With few exceptions, what makes people wealthy are rarely the smartest things they know. Unless you are doing cutting edge research or experimentation, what the world would benefit most from you doing is probably pretty easy to understand.

The richest, most powerful, most loved people are never the smartest.

If you are the smartest person you know, you have failed, you have learned at the cost of application, and you haven't sought out a true group of peers. How could a person who really spend time applying the great things they knew be smarter than a person that spent no time applying and just learned more?

Those who forsake the benefits of knowledge, for the hoarding of knowledge, will always know more and have less.

I've got great news for you, the smartest people in the world waste so much fucking time

That its super easy to outperform them. If you go to a Mensa meeting and hear what is being talked about, you're usually not talking about the most powerful ideas or the things that will make the biggest difference, you're usually talking about whatever is casually interesting and fun to argue about in that moment. Which is why for the most part those conversations don't turn into a successful business, and as a general rule you'll find that the smartest people aren't even the highest paid, or in the best positions, because in this world we don't care

about what you CAN do. We care about what you WILL do, and keep doing. Unused ability is a tragedy, not an shining example. Thus even if you aren't the brightest bulb in the box, you can still shit all over your coworkers with dedication and correctness of action.

Smartest is stupidest

I don't know whether it's bad luck or whether it's actually an effective sampling, but it seems like most of the books in the book area for nonfiction are written by people with PhDs. The funny thing about people with PhDs is that, for the most part, they're not so damn productive outside of, you know, academia.

R278

Everyone's constantly wrong

Sometimes smart folk aren't so smart

Many thought leaders like to let you make lots of decisions for yourself, because they don't want to offend you. This does you a disservice. There was once a movie I can't remember the name of, where one of the characters, I think it was John Malkovich, says that the problem with self-help is that you're an asshole, and now you are trying to be helped by an asshole, yourself. It's a funny way of looking at things. If you haven't heard of the Dunning-Kruger effect by now, it's really funny. It turns out that the people who know the least about things often think they know more than everyone else about it, because they're too stupid to know what they don't know. I'll be a little more adventurous with giving advice. I'm going to tell you things that you might not want to hear. This is life.

Many of the smartest people are wrong

The gist of the Monty hall problem is as follows, you're shown 3 doors. Behind 2 of the doors you'll find a lousy goat. Not even a good goat, this goat has terrible manners. Behind the 3rd door is the object of your deepest desires in material form. You must choose a door, and behind it, your prize. Do that in your mind now, choose door 1,2, or 3. Alright, now that you've chosen, I'm going to give you some help, I'm going to show you what's behind one of the doors that you didn't choose, and what I'm going to show you is a goat. Being so generous I'm even going to give you the opportunity to change your chosen door if you wish, before it's too late and all. Should you switch? Does it matter? Now that you know there was a goat behind one of the doors you didn't choose, does that even help? Should you switch? Does it matter? Now that you know there was a goat behind one of the doors you didn't choose, does that even help?

Wow, it helps. It helps and absolutely insane amount. It is entirely counterintuitive how much it helps. With the rules that I'm only ever going to show you a goat, and switch that actually, its better that the goat shower not be a conscious entity capable of side channel attacks on the chooser. We're going to flip this around to a machine instead of a human.

Anyway, when you switch doors, you win literally 2x as often as if you didn't switch. But wait? How could that be? Well quite simply when you were choosing with no knowledge, you had a 1/3 chance of winning. Then new knowledge appeared. It's easier to show you the value of this new knowledge with more doors. If there were 100 doors to choose from , then he showed you 98 goats behind 98 of the doors, leaving only 2 doors unopened. The one you choose at the start, and this other door, that seems very rare in its closeness now. In the 3 door problem, when you first chose your chances of winning were 1/3. Meaning the remaining 2 doors had 2/3 chance of winning. Now you have been shown which half of the 2/3 to win group was a loser, leaving the next door to win 2/3

of the time. That new knowledge allowed you to know that door he didn't open, is now 2/3 to win on its own, without the help of the useless goat door he just showed you

Most people get this wrong. Doubling your winnings is a big deal. When someone shows you a path, you must learn from the new information, it's kind of a parable for this book. I'm showing you some paths that don't work, how can that amplify your winnings on the remaining routes?

Wrong people

How so many people can be right about so much and then wrong about some and the difference between right and wrong. It's basically a bridge from the understanding of how people get the Monty hall problem wrong vs. knowing the value of getting it right. It doubles your odds, there's other things in life that you don't realize you're getting wrong that would double your performance that are counter intuitive, like not reading the news for example

Lying and truth telling people

We're very lucky that we have an inherent desire to tell the truth, most of us avoid lying whenever we can, and if forced to, feel guilty about it. Because of those great emotions, we can much more securely rely on the statements of those experts amongst us, because there's less profit for them in spreading lies than truth, usually.

Every once in a while someone will find more profit in telling a lie than telling the truth, and it is a sad event. You can find all kinds of examples such as lawyers defending the guilty, people threatened unethically with the use of force, and those that unknowingly lie out of ignorance, which you might say, is not a lie? There's a slippery slope there when you can choose to know or not know a thing. At what point does deliberate ignorance become liability?

Human robustness, behavioral diversity & redundancy

This lion was poached by a dentist, and it pissed off everybody people that liked lions were not happy that this dick head just killed it, and people that like everything else were pissed off that everyone else was mad about the lion when they should be mad about the other people. Some people that loved animals hated this guy for killing the animal, and other people that liked humans hated those people for being so outraged about a stupid lion when real human beings are dying. In reality they're all assholes, and here's why.

If you're lucky enough that some humans are compassionate about a single issue, thank goodness and take that blessing for what it is. You will find that in the scheme of humanity we need people to be different to have robustness and resistance to different types of fuck-ups. We have geographic redundancy so if there is a disaster somewhere there is some people left somewhere else. We also need behavioral redundancy, some people love animals, some people need to love people, some people need to do those charities, and it's not reasonable for you to fucking hate someone that's doing something "wrong" by your book, but it's still infinitely better than what they could have done.

Is Elon Musk going to mars going to cause me to die earlier, Yes! However much, much less early if he blew it on a yacht. The fact that he wants to go to mars is fabulous, and it would be more fabulous if his shit was more in lined with me. Let's not shit talk the poor guy because he's still doing better than anybody else. How about we go find some people that are doing way worse than him, and either catch them up with where he is or take them to the next level where we want them to be in the human resources in the human biology.

R68

The funny thing about most of performance in progress is that it's not intellectual for most

people. For most people, what they want to do, and what they want to have, take some very simple things that they understand quite well. You want to buy some expensive thing? You work more hours, you save more money, you spend less on other bullshit. Then after a while, you have the thing. But, people look at self-help and person development as some kind of fuckin' scam, because it has a touchy feely, emotional bullshit to it, when that's what they're missing. They're missing the touchy feely, emotional bullshit. It's the same reason if you go to see a film, right? Why is it colored purple and blue and green?

Why are the tints all weird? Why are the cameras at positions that humans' heads never go? 'Cause it makes for a better fuckin' movie. The touchy feely shit is the thing that makes the movie good. It's the thing that makes the music good, right? Why don't we just, like, carry a single tune, just constant? Well, we just don't, alright. We don't exactly know why we like something more than that, but that magic that makes art good, music good, film good, is the same magic that'll get you off your ass to do what you always knew you should.

R602

Feminism

Ever notice men complaining there's not enough plus sized male models? Do you hear woman complain about only skinny women models? Why is that?

Reality is a racist

Dinosaurists

If reality was a person, I'd never invite them to my birthday parties, because they're also sexist, communist, capitalist, socialist, nationalist, terrorist, and all the other "ists."

How can that be? Some of these things are contradictory!

Well you see, all of those ways of believing the world works, or should work, are effective some of the time. If those ways of thinking didn't produce some benefits for their followers, they'd be more "dinosaurist", and extinct, yet we see they're alive and well.

As well as some terrible ideas can be, anyway. All these "ists" are only the names we've given to groups of different beliefs and behaviors we've noticed in the real world. Reality plays favorites, it greatly rewards things that work, and strikes down those things which don't actually work. Why should we care what reality rewards and doesn't?

Idea receptor sites

If a belief is common enough to be called an "ist" it is well worth our time to discover what the rewards of that behavior are, and see if we can introduce an invasive idea species that pays the same or better rewards as the old bad beliefs but with the same or lower costs. If we introduce the new a better idea to the ecosystem that allowed the original inferior idea to flourish, then we can eat up all the food that it used to thrive on, fulfill the desires of the people that chose to believe it in the first place, and watch it go extinct, as all other animals have that were replaced by a newer animal better suited to reap the rewards that harsh reality brings to those he favors.

Well you see, we've made the system we live in - "reality" - seem like a person, with feelings and desires, who actively rewards and punishes. It turns out that it can be useful to believe that fiction for a bit, because it lets us use some parts of our brain that are really great at understanding other people, the parts that understand friendship and motive and good and evil, those advanced touchy feely emotional parts. Seeing non-human things as human is a good exercise to broaden the ideas you have about a thing, and then when you've taken a good look around the idea, you can

go back to the more common understanding that reality is a system, and systems aren't people.

So why is reality racist? Well for the same reason your body is racist. You come into this world literally as a single cell, then it divides and divides over time until you are the giant organized bunch of cells that absorb the light of this text hitting your eye and turns it into meaning. Why aren't you just the same cell over and over again? Why isn't the forest a single tree over and over again? That would be more equal wouldn't it? Variety is the spice of life they say, however in reality, variety is the definition of life. The DNA blueprint that makes up all living things has only 4 chemicals in it, A,T,C,G, and the fact that of all the chemicals in the world, only those 4 got to make of the blueprint of life is a pretty harsh sentence against all those other nice chemicals of the world. Then when you see that life must put those chemicals in an order, over and over again, to make the blueprint that is life. Well, that ordering is the definition of variety. It VARIES from all the other unorganized, optimized chemicals you can find lying about the planet.

Then that variation continues, again and again, the combination, mixing, matching, random chance, sex, viruses, you name it, over time the different blueprints of life get crazier and crazier, more and more different as more paths that work are found. If you can eat, move, crap, and procreate, then reality is going to let you keep playing in the game of life. On and on it goes until there's so many different kinds of functioning living, moving, fucking, life on the planet that you would have trouble ever seeing all the different kinds in a lifetime. Why does reality want so much difference and variety? Because only variety causes greatness, and reality loves to reward the man better adapted to him.

What does that have to do with race?

Race, like language, started as a regional difference. It was the best life could do to adapt to the situation it found itself in. Lots of sunlight, so the darker skin prevents too much penetrating through and knocking your precious DNA blueprints out of order in your cells, causing cancer. Quite hot, so longer limbs and body fat stored in the butt to maximize the surface area to get rid of the heat, and minimize the amount of body covered by heat insulating fat. Speed, fitness and strength due to a higher diet of animals that don't like being eaten. Larger nostrils for better breathing performance. Have you taken a look at physical sports involving movement, and seen what percentage of the world's best are black compared to the very small percentage of the world that is black? It's obvious there's a reason that Black people massively outperform all other races percentage wise, and it's not because they've had the easiest lives or histories.

How fast do you need to be to chase down your domesticated animal, or farm your land? Does your crop run from you when you come to kill it?

I chose reality as a man instead of woman. I invented dinosaurist.

Humans are dangerous

To give you an idea of how dangerous humans are, take a look at the injuries that killed people in history, you find lots of arrowheads stuck in other people.

Space between sexes

It seems like the only space program some countries have is trying to put more space between women and their rights. Fucking North Korea might actually have some people on the moon before some of these other even more backward fucks.

If you don't know a super useful gay person or woman, you haven't looked hard enough

More at (Gay): https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yuval_Harari

Woman: shitloads in biology, etc. Now the fact that this list is so shot in my own head makes me kind of doubt mentioning it. i.e. it kind of proves their exceptions to the rule, so I guess you could say, exceptions to the rule are still quite useful, so respect!

Gay holocaust

After the holocaust, gay people had to stay.

We need all the help we can get, that includes the fairer sex, and queers

It's said that homosexuality survives the test of time because the families that produce homosexual offspring have increased birthrates in the female offspring which offsets one of the male kids also having the loves men more gene as well. The other option could be that even selecting against homosexuality, it might just be really hard to design around, even if there weren't a side benefit. Not everything you see has evolved to greatness, somethings are just the best nature has been able to come up with given the ant of time it's been around, and the ant of generations it's had to iterate on different themes. Looking for side benefits is useful whether nature intended for them or selected for them or not.

The world is becoming more and more man made, and thus less and less naturally evolved faster every day. So understanding why man builds what he does, and what man is selecting for is probably much more important these days than understanding what natural evolution was selecting for. I must say if you want to see less pointless violence against people born gay, it could be very useful for the world to understand that being born gay is as natural as being born at all. It like sneezing, you don't always do it, but sometimes you do, and its natural. I include that last sentence only to point out that only because something is less common, doesn't make it any less natural. There's at least 3 times more chickens on earth than humans, and that doesn't make us unnatural. And there's about 10 times more straight people than gay people, it doesn't make them unnatural.

Now here's a useful distinction though, natural or unnatural doesn't mean useful or not useful, so depending on what you want out of the world, you should probably be referencing effectiveness towards some useful end instead of natural or unnatural when you're advertising the virtue of things. If you like fashion and interior design, and dance, and the list goes on, then homosexual men are obviously useful.

If you like having sex with me, and they like having sex with you, also pretty damn useful. If you like caring chatty, women like but stronger more muscular being, then gay men are probably once again just what the doctor ordered. Man, it's a pretty crazy world when much of it is so fucked up that you have to go out of your way to show the usefulness and naturalness of another person, or else useless shitty people will beat them up and or kill them. You murderers out there, if you want to make the world a better place, start killing the murders first, look at yourself in the mirror and kill what you see there first. If not in reality, at least in symbol.

How the fuck can we have laws on the books against inciting violence, and yet have books advertised, coveted, given special legal protections in some countries that quite clearly call for the murder of some innocent people? Is not that the incitement of violence? What...the...fuck? I'd care less if the body counts weren't flying up all the time. If the world wasn't getting deeper and faster infected with the cancerous idea.

Being born a woman, or gay, shouldn't be grounds for being forced into a shitty inferior life compared to your male or straight kin born right next to you. Its lose, lose. Life's hard enough without crippling more than half the population of the planet literally. More than half of all humans are women and or gay, so if you want to have a truly less effective planet, cripple those people and don't let them learn the same things, do the same things, have the same rights as the men. What an insane idea. It's hard enough to survive on this planet were

most of it is uninhabitable. 2/3 of the planet is water, and unless you breathe underwater, it's obvious that most of the planet can't support your life.

We need all hands on deck, and that means women and gay people too. Take a look at the GDP of nations that cripple their women and gay populations ability to produce, and you'll have at least one reason why they're getting their asses kicked economically and in most other benchmarks of human excellence, knowledge, and productivity as well.

It's as though a long time ago a decision was made to have more of a smaller pie, than an equal and larger ant of a larger pie. The rising tide raises all ships. Unless of course your ship is in a cave, and in that case, perhaps the rising tide crushes your ship is destroyed against the rocks. Unfair treatment, subjugation and restriction of your fellow man woman and queer are the rocks your economy will be crushed against as the rest of the world outcompetes you in every measureable way, except perhaps for oppression.

If there's a competition for most restrictive, unfair, unbalanced, oppressive society that's least productive per person, then You can win that competition I guess. The rest of us nice fair and friendly people will be cooperating and building the future. Maybe one day we'll let you ride in the space ships we built. Maybe one day we'll let you in our colonies on other planets. Maybe sometime between then and now you will learn the value of cooperation instead of subjugation.

Kids' behavior

American kids are doing better than ever

<https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=11094700>

<http://www.vox.com/a/teens>

It would be great if kids had better role models

If you cared about this other non-cool shit, the non-"get laid" stuff, if you care about that, well then, you're less likely to have kids, and then those ideas are less likely to get passed on. We have a heavy weighting in the societies in the world today, towards shit that gets you laid. Because people are bad at contraception. The more you get laid, the more kids you're going to have. Unless you're good at contraception or your dick doesn't work. Either one of those is fine, I guess. It would be great if kids had better role models. It would be great if there were enough people that made money with bio tech startups that people are like, "Fuck yeah, man. I want to do that. That's great."

SC1.81

Birthrates dropping fast

More at:

<https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=11592130>

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/to-your-health/wp/2016/04/28/teen-birth-rate-hits-all-time-low-led-by-50-percent-decline-among-hispanics-and-blacks/?hpid=hp_hp-top-table-main_teen-births-115pm%3Ahomepage%2Fstory

Quiverfull

Interesting title I saw used the womb as a weapon. More at:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quiverfull>

Crazy and weird ways we end up with lots of people

This dude gave 9 million dollars as a reward to the family that had the most children 10 years after his death. Upon a tie, split it evenly among the families. More at:

<http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/how-a-dead-millionaire-convinced-dozens-of-women-to-have-as-many-babies-as-possible/>

Reducing the speed of evolution

With the amount of mixing and catalysts that go on into guy and girl relationships these days, I think you're going to end up a rapidly evolving population, because the number or partners that each party has to choose from is nearly exponentially greater than it has been

historically. Therefore, the very best find it easier to find it easier to hook up with the other very best. Whereas only 30, 40, 50 years ago, you see the partners people had were nearly always within 2 to 3 miles within they were born and likely where they would die. Therefore, reducing their ability to select an optimum mate therefore reducing the speed of evolution.

R579

Top 10%

The result of that is going to be that the top 10% who can find the other top 10% of partners are basically going to diverge in excellence in quality of their offspring, away from the shittier class. Just to kind of like the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer, those with good genes are going to get even better genes and those with shittier genes are going to get even shittier. I think this increased canalization is just going to increase the range of goodness and suckness of offspring, which you know is great if you're on the great side of it.

Nonlinear gains by having more people and people that live longer. The world is under-crowded. If you keep the same standards of education, the same standards of welfare, and you increase the population of the planet by 10x you get more than 10 x more performance. Because progress is a collaborative act. There was a great television series called "connections" by James burke, in the 70s and 80's which showed how progress in one area let led to progress in other areas. The overcrowding conversation seems to be default for b people on the side of everyone thinking the world has too many people in it. It's quite stupid really.

Let's take a look at this idea of the world being overcrowded. Are we out of space? Interesting facts. Over 80 percent of Americans live within 1 mile, rather 10 miles of a sea boarder. Or just boarder, I have to look it up. Why do I mention this to you, because America is 3000 miles wide. If everyone just lives on the deter, edges of it, then you know that there is a whole lot of empty space in the middle.

Why is it that everyone wants to live on the edges? A couple reasons:

1. It's where the trade traditionally started, so the things you would want to buy would become available there first.
2. People seem to be drawn to the water, whether this was historically because it was where the most mixing of cultures occurred, or because we know there is food living in those oceans, and food can be pretty hard to come by.

It is pretty obvious we have all the space you could ever want. But y are there so many places that appear crowded, perhaps Asia. Because they choose to live on top of each other, its better. The food is better, the shopping is better. Of course you want to live in a city instead of the country, better chances for finding a beautiful mate, better chances for finding a great job, almost everything is better. Now, you might get stabbed to death, or you might get.

R580

Population control

If it wasn't clear, what that means is when there's so many people with fucked up stories right next door to you, maybe it's harder to maintain you having an amazing life and them having a terrible life. Maybe, uh, maybe I'm wrong though. Maybe Brazil's a great example of who gives a shit. What about food, there's no way we can feed all these people! You surely can actually feed all those people. Until I see people eating food they really don't like, on a regular basis, because the price of food is so high due to increase in If demand isn't rising, I wouldn't mind a world where people had to eat algae to survive, or figure out a better way to manage the resources that we have on this planet ,or better yet other planets.

I think the worst possible solution for overcrowding is to make sure that less people have the chance to live. If all this talk of population control is pretty barbaric really. It's like you win the lottery of birth, climb the ladder, and then make sure that no one else can get the same benefits that you did, because you pull the ladder up behind you. The least fair thing you could ever do would be to violently kill of your neighbors because you didn't want to decrease the quality of the food you were eating. The next worse thing would be to make sure that they never even had the chance to live in the first place, because you made sure they were never born. Imagine if someone had made that decision for you before you were born. You'd never have been here.

R247

Gender

Film spoken lines by gender and age

More at: <http://polygraph.cool/films/>

Sexual harassment

Histrionic

From <<http://micheleincalifornia.blogspot.sg/2016/05/lawyer-lawyer-lawyer-lawyer-lawyerlawyer.html>>

Animals

Animal Ethics & Cooperation

Cooperation obviously exists in the animal world; any time you see two animals with mouths not eating each other. I call that cooperation. Didn't eat the cubs? Nice. Bears do it all the time, eat those newborns. Any animals that don't do that could be considered more ethical.

R442

We like dangerous & intelligent animals

It is no accident that our favorite animals in the world to hang out with are cats and dogs. They are both predators. They eat other living things. They're probably what we like to hang out with the most because they are the most intelligent things that we could hang out with, and they needed to be that intelligent, because other things don't want you to kill and eat them they tend to run away. So the act of running is a lot simpler than the act of hunting, therefore the animals we like most are the animals that are the most dangerous and the most intelligent.

R70

Diminishing Returns

Peter Thiel

I think peter Thiel's perception that we've made great progress in the world of the bit but not very much in the world of the atom is similar in effect to the problem we've had with robotics and face recognition. The things that we've had the longest time evolving seem very easy to us, however they're actually not easy at all. The things where you get the fastest and most progress are the things that are brand new, and after you pick the low hanging fruit you discover that It's not that you were really bad ass that caused all the progress, it's that the tree hadn't had its fruit harvested yet. We are hard into diminishing returns in the world of the atom, because we've been working on atoms for so much longer than bits. Now to hedge this statement, you're not going to get progress unless you have people working hard on a thing, and lots of them, so it's probably also the case like a dying company, where they don't have the same income they used to, so what is the first thing they cut? Their marketing budget. The one thing that could save them, they get rid of it first.

I think you could see the same kind of effect when an industry turns out to be super hard, like nuclear fusion, instead of amplifying how many people attack it, they get reduced, because the risk that it takes more than your lifetime to achieve something, and you only get one lifetime, is too much of a sacrifice for many.

Being right and having a new enemy is not what you're looking for

My buddy Bill says that I'm very pragmatic. He's like the only guy that said that. I've had a lot of people tell me that I preach a lot. Like my nickname when I used to play on a ping pong team was Preach. Like, because, man, I like to spread ideas that I believe in, I guess. [silence 58:58.4 - 59:20.9] Right. [silence 59:21.8 - 60:04.3] Yeah. Like, that whole like - I'm creative enough to find the framework where anything I say would fit. Do you know what I mean? Like if I want to talk about something, I'll find the bridge to get there and make it relevant. [silence 60:26.6 - 60:37.9] It's bad for everything. Being right and having a new enemy is like not what you're looking for. "I'm smarter than you are! Now tell me to fuck myself despite both of us!" Like, it's not the right way to do things.

SC1.57

Science

Science is broken

If half the papers published produce results that can't be replicated, then lots of scientists are fucking up. At least remove the "HARK:ing" Hypothesizing after the results are known. Publish more of what hasn't worked and isn't interesting to save others from unknowingly going down the same dead ends. Sadly, if the science is so bad as to be un-replicable, then who cares if you publish or not as you were 50/50 wrong anyway. The math could be better, however the idea stands that bad science can and is being done to the detriment of the world. Thinking you know a thing and being wrong about it, is worse than thinking you do not know a thing and being accurate in your estimation.

Science is being done wrong

Can't replicated results

More at:

<https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=10960411>

<https://reason.com/archives/2016/01/19/broken-science/print>

Science getting shittier

Science is getting shittier because you can't reproduce half the studies results. The problem is there's no rewards in publishing the things you didn't find. Which makes little sense to me, for how shall the next person know you didn't find it and prevent himself from doing the same work?

Why do we focus on science saving people instead of just medicine?

Doctors apply what researchers create. Researchers create with fancy computers, machines, imaging, chemicals, compounds, you name it, lots and lots of non-medical science goes into nearly all the things that the medical industry considers progress. There is no medical progress without general scientific progress. General scientific progress is the tide that rises all ships. Obviously we can influence which parts of the science get focused on to be more useful to the medical fields. There's also all kinds of side benefits from great science that improves the quality of life that you just can't get by focusing on medicine alone. You really can't forget the engineers businessmen, legal systems, salesmen that allow all these great things to literally reach you. If you are making a rate my sandwich app though, fuck you. I hope you find a more empowering and fulfilling use for your creative skills.

Religion

If you don't believe in god, jail for you

https://www.reddit.com/r/europe/comments/48n9tc/russian_faces_up_to_year_in_prison_for_denying/

Perhaps death in Muslim places

Evolution

Remember if you want to be effective as religion has been is to (Darwinian historian woman did some studies, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SDhtTHP16aA> 49;15 evolution of religion.

Collectivism

So religion is a way to take advantage of collectivism, however so is hooliganism, and it doesn't come with dietary restrictions, so, yes, collectivism can be better, and worse.

Religions don't spend much time doing anti other religions stuff.

You ever notice religions seem to be doing great without any anti other religions pushes?

Like they don't hand out guidebooks on why other religions are so stupid that I've seen?

They've learned that it does work I assume? Well, they do kinda kill ya in Islam if you switch so, maybe being gratuitously unfair does work. Be white light, don't try to cancel out some other tint of light by canceling it out. Bullshit generates faster than anti bullshit.

Golden rule origin

If the golden rule is the best we got, then why are we assigning it to Christianity, if he didn't invent it? And if he didn't invent, doesn't that just mean he's imitating the religion that preceded him? Richard: Source its first existence.

Multiple gods

Multiple gods was cool because you had more dudes in your gang.

Heal thyself

"**Physician, heal thyself** ([Greek](#): ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν — *latre, therapeuson seauton*), sometimes quoted in the Latin form *Cura te ipsum* ("heal thyself"), is a [proverb](#) found in [Luke 4:23](#).

23 Then he said, "You will undoubtedly quote me this proverb: 'Physician, heal yourself' — meaning, 'Do miracles here in your home town like those you did in [Capernaum](#).'

The usual interpretation of this passage is that, during the [Rejection of Jesus](#), Jesus expected to hear natives of his home town of [Nazareth](#) use this phrase to criticize him.^[1] [Luke the Evangelist](#), to whom Christian tradition attributes the gospel, was himself a physician.^[2]

The moral of the proverb is counsel to attend to one's own defects rather than criticizing defects in others,^[3] a sentiment also expressed in the [discourse on judgmentalism](#).

The Latin form of the proverb, *Cura te ipsum*, was made famous in the Latin translation of the Bible, the [Vulgate](#), and is a shortening of the phrase *medice, cura te ipsum*.

Some commentators^[who?] claim that the proverb is also an echo of the insults that he would hear while hanging on the cross, that is, the words may be interpreted as echoing the taunts to come down from the cross himself.^[4]"

From https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Physician,_heal_thyself

God helps those that help themselves

God helps those that help themselves isn't actually biblical. Common misquotes or contradictions or both list.

Rewards

Be a bad firefighter get to heaven faster.

Islam

Starbucks

More at:

https://www.reddit.com/r/worldnews/comments/43znbp/women_barred_from_entering_starbucks_in_saudi/

Lots actually!

Get raped

Reproduce

Serve as sexual object

Breathe

Get stoned (no ganja involved)

From

<https://www.reddit.com/r/worldnews/comments/43znbp/women_barred_from_entering_starbucks_in_saudi/>

Get raped

Actually getting raped is illegal.

Reproduce

Actually reproducing out of wedlock is illegal.

Serve as sexual object

Actually inciting lust is illegal.

Breathe

Only if you can do it while being covered head to toe. If you can't, fuck you, die.

Get stoned.

Actually getting stoned is illegal. The punishment is stoning.

From

<https://www.reddit.com/r/worldnews/comments/43znbp/women_barred_from_entering_starbucks_in_saudi/>

Religious support

Find religious support for medicine activities in all popular religions

Choose your battles

You know atheism and deism are just means to an end, if you can be a great person doing either of these things, that's what matters. Arguing about which one is right isn't as good as reaching good ends, unless they're taking too much of your time. The world has been kicking a fair amount of ass with these shitty things in place.

Impact percentage

The mission here is to get the minimum backlash. This has been covered again and again for quite literally thousands of years, and I believe covered at least to about 60 percent as well as it can be covered. I will not accept less impact and influence in the 85 percent of the world that's religious by breaking their desire to listen, by selling some shit they're unlikely to believe or actually adopt. If there's a hot button issue, this is it. If there is a thing that is not only hot button, but can get you literally death threats, this is kind of it, if you mention that which must not be named.

Faith healers

If the FDA doesn't allow you to sell things that cure cancer when they really don't, they put you in jail. Well then how come faith healers and other assholes that have even less of a shot of healing anything can say that stuff? Shouldn't that be illegal?

R706

Politics

Congressional Secret Ballot

Perverse incentives. Congress used to be able to vote privately, now when a corporation buys your vote as a congressmen, they can verify you deliver what they paid for. "Cardboard box reform"

Better candidate pool

Geniuses don't go into politics, the pay sucks and you can't get much done. We can at least fix the pay. If bad voting, but good candidate pool then still win. If great voting but bad pool, only lose. What use is voting when you have choice of puppet A or puppet B both presented by the same Mega Corps?

Better voting by better voters

Voting licenses. If you are stupid enough that I don't want you editing the settings of my OS on my computer, why would I want you editing my democracy? Is not governance advanced enough and complicated enough to require a license to effect changes through voting, just as cutting hair is licensed? Yes, it's dangerous, yes if the tests suck you get unfair amplified power to the test makers. However, if you want greatness, you must select for it. You will

never having voting excellence if you don't try.

Better voting by better intel gathering

Why capture a single data point of "who do you want to win?" Choose instead "put these people in order you'd take them." Now you've captured 8x the data from the voter? Now you can combined the ordered lists to get an electorate that everyone kind of likes and few people hate, as opposed to the 51 percent voting to gouge out the eyes of the 49 for idle pleasure. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Condorcet_method

Nazi trip to Tibet

Interesting fact, the Nazi's did indeed have an expedition to Tibet:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1938%E2%80%931939_German_expedition_to_Tibet

Politics / news

If you have a narrative you push by lying about facts, and ignoring events or hiding events, the voting of citizens can never be correct, for good votes only occur upon good data and then good decision. No good data, no good decisions.

Pay more for qualified applicants

The thought leaders and politicians we have to choose from today are pretty the fuck weak. We can do better! As long as the private sector pays more, why would we have greatness in this area?

Unity isn't worth shit

So many people put emphasis on unity and getting over differences. This is entirely the wrong focus. Unity is a friend when the path is true, and unity is the enemy when the path is false. What really matters is the justness of the action, and not what percentage of the people are following it. You could say an exception to that is communication networks, where standards, even crappier ones, more than make up for their lack with the ability to participate in the network at all due to standardization. There are these suicide cults where everyone kills themselves, in unison. Doing the wrong thing together is far worse than being divided.

If diversity is strength, quit trying to destroy it..

Many of the proponents of unity also celebrate diversity as strength. Which are opposite positions. If diversity is strength, why destroy the diversity of behavior or identity?

Ignore and shun the heinously wrong.

By the way, how have the profits for America of the last few undeclared wars been, as a dollar figure? What was the positive return in dollars, or in any other area for rearranging the landscapes slightly of those far away lands? And what was the cost? At what point does the public fulfil its duty, and demote these idiots out of the public life, out of opinion making? If you're wrong about something that costs tons of american lives, and yes I mean physical tons of young american bodies, their futures stolen. You need to shut the fuck up, get the fuck off stage, and remain quiet. Your inaccuracy in predicting the outcome of a major action didn't have the requisite respect for a higher burden of proof. Outstanding actions and claims require outstanding evidence.

Heinously wrong people, do one honest thing. Honor those dead Americans, whose misfortune your reckless ideas are partly responsible for, with your silence. Step off the public stage, look upon your past words, and learn from those who were right, where you were not.

Security

TSA

How would the fucking TSA line look if you got to search them back?

Privacy

Your search history

Your google search history knows more about you than you do. You ever use google translate for a receipt? You ever google your own name? Now google knows where

you are by IP address, where you are by physical address, what you buy, who you talk to, who else in the world cares to search who you are, when you're online. What websites you go to. If you use Gmail it's even worse, you don't have to leak personal info into their search box, they just read all your email by default, and make whatever marketing decisions they choose with it. We see that Mr. John Smith here sends lots of emails about keyboards. I guess we'll start marketing keyboards to him in the banners and text ads we show him.

Better watch that paste. Maybe you copied more than you thought you did, and now you have basically just sent all the data to google. There better not be any naked pictures of yourself in there, perhaps doing something illegal, say if you were doing something gay in a country where being gay was punished by death.

You better hope that google box was SSL encrypted, and you weren't being man in the middle hacked with one of those bullshit fake other SSL certificates that governments like to get, so they can get in the middle of all your "secure" connections with their real certificate, used for evil purposes.

What's that? You don't inspect every SSL cert on every page you visit to see if there's actually an evil cert in between you and who you think you are talking to? And even if you did try to check, how easy is it for you to know which certificates are real and which are fake?

No idea how many laws there are

<http://www.thoughtcrime.org/blog/we-should-all-have-something-to-hide/>
<https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=11186871>

Asymmetric privacy

The government is made of humans. The humans in the government have their privacy protected by very, very strong laws. If you leak the wrong human's secrets, you could be executed for treason. If you however the lowly citizen wants privacy, fuck you. You used an ISP to handle your email, well then, no privacy for you, because you let them see it. If you used the regular post office, your letters would be in your house, and they'd get 4th amendment protections. Your email? Nope. Your phone records? Nope. Your position in the world? What websites you visit? Nope, no 4th amendment protections, because the case law says you waved your right to an expectation of privacy, because another company other than you has the data. What the fuck?

We need digital protections of our rights the same way that we fought so hard for analog protections of our rights. If your snail mail is protected, your email should be protected. If your house is protected, your cell phone should be protected. Let's say someone wanted to see some pictures of you naked. Which of these locations are they more likely to find those pictures?

Experiments

I'm not sure I like how these experiments are turning out? What's the best ratio of quality to quantity? Maybe disdain for quality and sacrificing aesthetics and comfort for performance, as the seemingly cruel hand of natural selection does produces the best results over 2 generations? I'm not sure advertising the suck is useful here. Where are they doing kids in larger quantities the right way? Perhaps the reason the people that choose mass quantities of children at the cost of their own enjoyment of life is suboptimal is because it's rather healthy and common to actually care about your quality of life, and not want to rather risk it by having the maximum number of kids, and for people to select the apparently crazy option, they have to be a little whacky. Perhaps there's a great way to raise kids in mass and have be less whacky, I hope so. Threshold 3 events. Little differences add up.

Laws

Gun Control

Where things are going, gun control and quality of life

So gun propagation in the United States is an interesting thing. It's one of the newer countries around the block and it was built off of having to overthrow very overbearingly repressive regime.

So the downside to having a population full of guns is that the people are going to use them to shoot each other all the time. Which is why we have 30k plus gun deaths here in the United States. However the upside is if anyone tries to invade or if the government turns into a piece of shit like it you know happens in Africa. So in Africa every time they are going to kill off and do genocide in a population one of the first things they do is make having guns illegal. That way the population can't fight back. And if you look throughout history and a good guy to get a reference on these matters is, well if you Google it there's an Alex Rowe's episode with the guy. He's got a lot of really cool ideas. And his title that up says the resilience guru.

Vinay Gupta is his name, he points out that all the genocides that have occurred and all the millions of people that have died through government force on purpose trying to kill off people. And not even like their own like wars like their own actual populations. Gun control is a big part of how they do that. So if you want to know where the next genocide is going to be in a screwed up country you can just see which ones banning gun ownership. Thus the problem is you can either pay thirty thousand a year now as a price of insurance against government tyranny or you can get rid of the guns. And then when shit goes wrong someday in the future, perhaps, it goes wrong in a worse way.

So that's the trade off. Lots and lots of gun deaths and violence today for an insurance policy against the type of tyranny and oppression that some countries still go through or get rid of the guns and live a nice clean happy life like you know Australia and Canada and most other civilized western nations however it isn't for free. Another entity can come invade you and or your government can turn against you. And then you're in a pretty tough spot with no weapons to fight back with.

So this is a common trope going around that we shouldn't have an armed population because the government is just too strong. And it's the dumbest thing I've ever heard. Because when we deploy larger numbers of armed men with a greater desire to just kill on sight say in Afghanistan. That less armed to population seems to be absolutely unconquerable in a smaller quantity with less firearms. So then how can you translate that American law enforcement with weaker tools against a better trained better armed more populous population is somehow going to lose the battle if the government of America ever wants to go to war with the people of America. The government of America is going to fucking lose and it's going to lose hard unless they just nuke it all you know cancel out Earth. So, no having a more armed more effective more militarized law enforcement system will not allow them to win an oppressive government regime against an armed American population. It won't happen.

Anyway so in case it was a clear my two points are one America should do the same thing that every other intelligent country in the world did by enacting the same type of gun legislation that they did. And two, if for whatever reason the

United States military turned super evil they're not going to win in a battle against the American population currently with the arms that that population has.

And three. Even if America continues its policy of having an insurance policy against tyranny in the future by letting huge portions of people die every day. Guess what, that's kind of good for the world because those gun deaths aren't happening in your country. And then if there's some tyrannical thing and they overthrow it through force of will you get to just move there after they've done the hard work of executing you know and getting the pay off of their insurance policy and throwing off their oppressors right. So it may be globally good that there's a shitload of gun deaths in America just because they'll be the last bastion against some type of evil New World Order. Long story short in 40 or 50 years the world is going to be such a nice place the most of the shit won't matter anyway. I hope.

For you guys that think the future's not that good check out Hans Rosling birth rates are going down, technology is increasing. So guess what will have less people with cooler shit therefore higher quality of life therefore probably less conflict. Boom.

Sex laws

Oral is sodomy? Thus illegal? If Catholics have wildly high birth rates, and they make premarital sex and masturbation disallowed and punishable, then perhaps adding the taboo to the built in lust is actually an effective way to supercharge their lust in the teens. Maybe trying to fight what can't be fought effectively, amplifies the opposite outcome, and thus has been selected for. It's like the faker fucker strategy. It looks like you're trying to stop sex, but really, your causing more sex.

Absurdity of stacked indictments

Absurdity of stacked indictments, genocide and littering. Insane conviction rates, either they're not trying enough cases, or the penalties are too high for risk.

You could have predicted this right?

More at:

https://www.reddit.com/r/dataisbeautiful/comments/48q3w8/the_uber_effect_causes_a_10_drop_of_dui_arrests/

Risk management

Law stuff

The bad guys are out to get you

Live in a place with fewer and nicer bad guys.

The police are out to get you

Live in a place where the police are nicer because the bad guys are nicer.

What fun!

If you live in a nice place where the crime rates are low, you don't have to lay down on the ground face down and fuck your clothes up when you get pulled over. The guy approaching your car may not have his gun unsafely and ready to draw, because he doesn't need to, because the people he deals with are literally a higher class of people and less likely to start trying to pump him full of hot lead.

How many people have called the police only to be themselves arrested?

Never speak to the police

More at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6wXkl4t7nuc>

The defendant that represents himself in court has an idiot for a client.

Automated ticket fighting

More at:

<https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=11138419>
<http://uk.businessinsider.com/joshua-browder-bot-for-parking-tickets-2016-2?r=US&IR=T>

Being innocent is no reason to be released

<https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=11409173>

The rights of the distantly unborn

Perhaps the rights to honor the dead? If we're going to honor things that are nothing more than ideas in our heads then I think that it should go in more than just the future direction. Let's take a look at the global overcrowding issue. could it be the case that there are too many people on the planet? Sure, for you, there might be. Now a good habit to take whenever you look at any question is to test different variables, for instance, stick a large and a small number in there, a good and a bad outcome, etc.

How would you feel about the population of the world being 0? How would you feel about the population of the world being so high that there were so many wars over resources that it was hard for anyone to have a nice life? Now what if you shift your perspective 100 years in the future, perhaps the net result of the wars was selection of the fittest? Or perhaps the world no longer exists. You have to test all the outcomes, and multiple time frames to really know a thing, and to know which perspective serves you the best.

If I advocate for more children in the world, and we maintain similar levels of education for them and opportunity, then a better than linear outcome is to be expected. Now what's my outcome if I lobby for less kids? My skyline has less buildings in it? I get to learn less because less discovery is done, because we have less thinkers thinking. It's just a bad outcome.

Crime

Identity projects , this guy has great ideas on solving crime in cities

Michael A. Wood, Jr.

https://www.YouTube.com/watch?v=PG_xHE9LLsc

Tech

Pro Tips

Stay out of jail

If torrent then stop seed on 0. Use VPN. Set seeds to minimum, use newsgroups instead.

Google tips

Google.com/ncr if you are tired of google giving you EU edited search results, or foreign language you

Good startup tools

More at:

<http://www.analyzo.com/>
<https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=10983937>

Environment ass kicking

Check your blacks crushing on lagrom.nl or whatever that site is, check your bid depth 4:4:4 shit. Turn on game mode

Game theory

Tit for tat, tit for 2 tat in Bit Torrent choking.

Opsec, wow, your browser owns you

More at: <https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=11407536>

Solve for chromium: <https://github.com/gorhill/uBlock>

Improve the tech world

Random make world better

More things should collapse and expand, for instance the videos uploaded section on a YouTube channel should be easy to assign to categories and not need to update to a playlist all the time. Also why not treat the world as sortable by its relevant

descriptions, like files in a computer, cost, size, weight, rating, date, etc. I don't know how the playlists function actually works, but it seems to be a mass of data with no drill down, and poor sorting by 2 clicks of a hidden dropdown, instead of all options available like a file explorer window.

Multi-use software

It's funny that you don't see software do more of that "everything approach" instead of a single thing approach. Like why doesn't someone make if this then that, like manage your life for you, you know? Are you fat? Yes. Okay, then, you know here's the diet website you're going to read. Have you finished reading the site? Like if you can get a human being to comply with a list of programmed instructions, and then maybe "if this then that" kind of system, then I guess you could create better humans through following orders. I don't want to say computation but I guess that's what computation is. Better humans through computation. Like, software that does much much broader set of things.

R735

Computer stupidity, tech tips

What's more likely, you're the only person that uses your computer, and when you upgrade it, being able to copy paste your programs and settings in a single directory to your new computer, is awesome. Or, that you need to cluster fuck your programs and files in hidden directories all over the place, and now upgrading is damned hard. Fuck the impossibility of upgrading. All apps should be portable apps. When more users use the same install separately from each other, and then we would have a reason to use the existing terrible model.

Needing to replace all the computers parts when screens, mice and keyboards rarely change, but CPUs, memory and hard drives change rapidly, is quite stupid.

Die like Steve Jobs

Maybe in their brains, they don't think about that stuff. Perhaps they should, because how do you know that you're living your life the right way unless you're actually knowledgeable of what the hell you're really doing? Your relationship with the world, your relationship with your family, your relationship with yourself. Unless you're keeping track of those relationships, you'll do a Heath Ledger. You'll do - I could list you all types of people that were successful and are doing way worse than you and me. Steve Jobs, [inaudible 31:12.8] is on a list. Successful people, world loved them, shitload of resources, dead as fuck. Didn't have to go that way, right?

SC1.33

General improvements

Windows 10

The disable mouse cursor while typing feature really needs to work :(

Websites

People that visit websites want a specific thing. You can tell what that thing is by eye tracking, and time on page, etc. Its very likely most of your pages are more confusing than they are useful to the people visiting.

I wanted to find some good speech recognition software, and I hit tons of giant megacorp, call for pricing bullshit websites, without prices, or without any way at all to differentiate them from the mass of other shitty megacorp websites I hit. So did I call all the nearly identical competitors? Nope. I got the fuck out of there, and on with my life, because I don't have time to become a sales lead for your shitty sales processing, hidden pricing and hidden features. Fuck you. Differentiate or die. Its not my job to figure out why I should give you my money, its your job to tell me why I should give you my money. I AM NOT YOUR SALES TEAM.

As a universal principle, google knows what you really want from a site, because they

know what you searched for, and depending on how much data your chrome or android is leaking, they can tell how long you spent on the site. They might be able to tell just by analyzing other behaviors you might have on their system that could tell them at least that you are "not" reading that site that you clicked, because you're busy typing an email in gmail in another browser on a small enough screen that you couldn't see both at the same time. Anyway, with all that data about what people are looking for, and what they're clicking (if you are using google analytics, they know. (the website you are visiting I mean.)) Then if google was nice enough, they could alert all the website owners of the world which of their pages appeared to be rather useless. And which of their pages were useful, and where people were spending the most time on the page. This would allow the world to cull lots of shit content. It would allow more people in the world to find the information they were actually looking for.

Someone somewhere should be notifying all the shitty companies and shitty websites that they are shit, and they should feel bad, or perhaps something more motivational,, but you get the idea, there's lots of shitty stuff out there, and we'd all be better off if it weren't that way.

The Future

Predictions

Don't assume that future looks like the linear extrapolation from today, for progress itself is progressing. Therefore, since we don't understand exponentiality so well, the future will be a lot more different than you think it will be. Of course. That's what they thought about robots in the 50s too. I guess we'll amend that statement to say, for things where our predictions have been accurate over some period of time, they're likely to continue to be accurate, and for things where predictions were inaccurate, they're likely to remain inaccurate. Elon Musk is quoted as saying that he has more confidence in his predictions, where he was proven to underestimate things repeatedly.

R860

The intelligence of machines is not artificial

Why is artificial intelligence called artificial. Perhaps machine intelligence is a better term, I think intelligence is pretty damn common among non-humans, I mean if you are capable of separating out the emotional aspects of intelligence, chemicals and complex reactions seem to figure out how to find each other and do cool stuff without much in the way of motive, is that intelligence? How intelligent are plants? How intelligent is the tide? I just think that to call the study of intelligence in machines artificial, is a little misleading.

Cool ideas

Power of reputation systems

The power of feedback systems and reputations systems and finding the maximum number of places to implement them. I bet if you made a graph of, uh, human beings by quote success level, good luck like actually estimating what someone's success level is. Maybe it's something like body fat adjusted for age, income adjusted for age. Uh, yeah I don't know what else would be easy to measure. I wonder what the shape of the chart would look like, by success on the X axis. I think it'd be like a giant fucking, uh, bell curve, because they're like ubiquitous – fancy word for everywhere. That means basically that, uh, it's pretty hard to super fail and it's pretty hard to super win. By pretty hard I mean really. 1 person cuts 1 person chooses. Distributed systems.

R232

Laser imagining to blueprint

Interesting idea, laser imagining to blueprint where the eyebrows should go, where dental implants should be placed. Too much is left up to change. We can measure people better and place things better without random measurement inaccuracy.

R593

Book updates & Wiki for classics

Why it that books are never is really updated, for instance the book how to win friends and influence people hasn't been updated. Then you take the classics, like shouldn't someone go write the opposite of the classic? if the classic is a piece of shit? Like if Carl Marx writes the communist manifesto, and you are of the opinion that it's a flaming piece of crap. Why don't you write your demolition of it, or if not referencing it.

Here's my opposite of that. If a book is more popular than your book than you're better off assuming the opposite position and putting yourself in the same popular mind space as opposed to trying to create your own separate mind space that people may not understand as a refutation of the other one. Because people read a finite number of books. Usually far less than we would all hope and they just might not get around to yours. Better that they are both on the bookshelf and they pick the one that has better views better cover? Better summary of content?

If they're smart enough to look at that table of contents. In summary I think that any book worth writing is worth updating constantly as new information comes to light. It's a tragedy that it's not done. I think any of the classics should be revisited for accuracy now that we have wikis. If you could have a wikis for knowledge could not you have a wiki for reining the salesmanship for certain ideas? Like shouldn't there be a capitalist wiki that says "this is why capitalism is awesome". At some point, if the arguments were refined enough, then you could almost make a chain of proof, that says "yeah this beats that" but I've never really seen this type of thoughtful discourse.

R33

Disproving and improving ideas

In theory, you could take a book, and issue all of its thesis and statements on a wiki or forum, and allow discussion on them. If the discussion was able to disprove or provide improvements for certain language or ideas then you kind of have a crowdsourced version of the book that was new and improved, whereas if you leave the ideas up to one or two people in one or two random places and watching them fall flat on their face its worse. In theory if you wrote a shitty book everyone should log on and demolish your book, and you know if you were an honest person you could go ahead and say hey "i was wrong about everything and I learned how to be right, and here's what it looks like, and here's why we think so, and if you don't agree we'll see you on round three of the book.

R416

Even with the subject as time honored as atheism, I've never seen a book that systematically disproves it, the four horseman of the atheist movement Dan Dennet, Sam Harris, Chris Hitchens can't remember the others. Hitchens well received book was called "God is not great" sure as fuck was not mathematical I'll tell you that it's more anecdotal if anything. It had a lot of silly appeals to emotion in there, like don't believe in God, because if he does exist he's a mean prick. Pretty emotional. Don't sound so logical. Maybe pricks are great? Maybe your judgement on pricks is inaccurate. Then we have Sam Harris's letters to a Christian nation. As far as I'm concerned I think it can be done better, maybe I'm the guy to do it better? Or, maybe conquering that stupidity isn't as good as attacking pro aging trance bullshit.

R33

Focus control

Real world ad blocking. One day if we have glasses that can do augmented reality, they could detect and block ads in real time, so that you block the irritating ads of the real world the same way that you can block the irritating ads on the internet.

Idea Distribution

What ideas can be said to be available and promoted for free. You could say it's religious

ones because they print the Bibles and move them around and doing missionary work. You can say that in socialist countries and maybe there are some countries that do it that aren't socialist. That the government pays to give people free education. But when you see where the government actually got their money by force from other citizens. It's a forced redistribution of wealth between the citizens that create the wealth by the people that don't actually create the wealth they just help create the framework that allows the wealth to be possible. Yes. Governments are still viable but let's not pretend that they're the biggest job makers or even close to even close it.

We'll still for the purposes of this argument call free government education free. Why doesn't the government just buy licenses to books that are affordable and send an email to everyone on the planet with a link to all the free books or include them as an attachment or send them on a CD or send the money U.S.B. stick. Why doesn't the government perform its function which they have declared as making a better world through education? In some countries, you can get free education no matter where you're from. You need only apply. As an American, it's very hard to believe that it's like crazy talk because in America, you really have to fight for what you have. It feels really weird when you get things for free or what seems to be free on a cursory analysis.

I pose you that question. Why is it that if the world becomes a better place. When these better, superior ideas that people are not born with are taught about educated about actually use. It's quite affordable to buy an e-mail list or to buy a snail mail mailing list or to buy a billboard. All of those things are very affordable for a nation state, nearly any nation state. Why is it that you don't see them promoting what they claim to spill is so important in this education. And this adoption of Western values and Western ideals of that there's the quality and women should have the same rights the men have all of these bad ass things that don't actually get adopted as ideas in the rest of the world.

Why aren't they putting their money where their mouth is and spending money on media distribution and marketing? To make the world a better place. If the nation states don't have the balls to do it then maybe the philanthropists have the balls to do it. I want to see a marketing movement of people that care about today's reality and tomorrow's future, spending money making the world a better place by spreading those ideas. Particularly given the fact that there's nearly nothing in the world cheaper to spread than and electronically distributed idea. It doesn't cost much to get visitors to your website doesn't cost much to send emails. It doesn't cost much to do lots of mass media marketing.

It probably costs even less when people will take a reduced rate because you're basically a charitable endeavor trying to make the world a better place. As a matter of fact there is a special concession in the law that allow you to call people and email people with permissions that businesses couldn't. As a business you can't just spam everyone you want and call everyone you want. You have to maintain it and subscribe to a Do Not Call list there's all these things you have to do. But is a charity or a politician here exempted from some of the same requirements. Considering the fact that it's probably cheaper to negotiate a deal by the marketing, you have a more lax and relaxed regulatory environment in order to execute the marketing and so many amazing ideas are off patent. They're already in the public arena. I just read a design book by a guy named Frank Sales Meyer.

It is a hundred twenty year old book. It's called the handbook of ornament or the handbook of ornamentation. It was originally in German I believe so the American titles, you know are different than the German one. Being a different language and all, it's amazing. It's absolutely fantastic. You know having looked at lots of design in art and architecture. I really haven't seen anything so much better than what I saw in his drawings and I was like wow

that's amazing that one hundred twenty years ago. I think that you would find the same ability to spread amazing ideas that are off patent, off copyright.

If you couldn't, it's probably still a good idea for you to reward financially the creator of whatever today's best ideas are and spread that. You know like a book writer will write a book for two hundred thousand dollars. When the publisher gives him that money, well then maybe the government can give two hundred thousand dollars to a bad ass author and have a bad ass state sponsored state owned book that now they can spread make the world a better place. So let's see, Governments and philanthropists and forward thinking people put their money where their mouth is and start to make impact in the world.

The same way those businesses do through marketing, through message through mnemonic through color scheme through product placement through having a halo idea, through unique benefit statements and limited time offers and you know associating with successful people, proof by peer or the more fancy way version of saying that social proof. Let's see it happen. Doesn't cost that much money what is a government spend on a dumb idea in a year. Oh my Lord, the numbers millions billions. This is a great way to get scale. A great way to do public works, a great way to make the world a better place where currently the only people, shoving ideas down your throat for the most part are trying to fuck you out of some money doing something that's probably not that great for you.

R328

Never building for the just one time, make it a kit and let others benefit

Spreading great ideas, a catalyst for all invention and progress. Cross pollinating specializations, different attitude types and different ways of looking things leads to paradigm breakthroughs more easily. Having the courage to try more things, trying to ask how you can do things 10x bigger, faster, larger, throwing in a large number small number and 0, see where the math goes. Getting maximum value out of all the abilities the cellular peons have now. Distributed anonymous companies. Sales is motivation for the globe treated as a single person. Motivation is personal sales selling yourself do to things as the world uses marketing to motivate it. The individual and the group of individuals that are the globe have many things in common. It could be a fallacy that the parts are the same as the whole and the whole is the same as the parts, however I think it's more useful than it is confusing, at least how I understand it.

I wonder what other amazing breakthroughs have a common theme? Nanotech? Moore's law, and all the things that will become less expensive because of it? Replacing human memory requirements with creativity, since google and books do an amazing job of normal memory retention now. Foundation that points out logical fallacies where they're found as well. They'll have busy lives.

Biology coder dojo

Tony said there should be a Coder dojo for biology, great idea!

R362

Where did iron come from?

I have to readdress that issue: did iron really come from organisms? Is organic life the thing that allowed iron to exist, because that's fucking awesome if that's true.

R385

Global next button

There should be a global "next" button shared by all members of a room so that everyone has veto power.

R517

Cameras

Pretty cool idea to have like a quick run through of your store on the camera, on a LCD outside your store, so people are enticed to enter. Assuming that the inside of your store

doesn't suck.

R560

Getting people to invest in Longevity

So my point is that that's of why bitcoin's good. There's a lot of other reasons why bitcoin's good. Getting people to donate 5% of their savings for longevity research should get you into a member of a club where you get discounts other people don't get. Why not? Why the fuck not? It's free for the companies, right? So I just registered these domain names with bitcoin, and I registered them there, why? Because [inaudible 105:44.9] the bitcoin. Did I have to? No. But I wanted to support the fucking ecosystem. Right? And it's faster, easier. I don't have to worry about declining because we're [inaudible 105:57.3] bullshit.

SC1.105 & QW.SC1.105

Getting People to invest in Longevity

The guys that started the longevity movement, they had something called The 300 Club. And The 300 Club was like, "Look. We need some goddamn money. Give us some goddamn money. We're a pretty good name in this club. You'll be a member of the 300 people that tried to fucking do something. You'll go down in history as important." I can't name any I want to list. I can't remember how much money they gave, or whatever. But it just seemed to me like something that wasn't compelling enough. Artificially limiting that number to 300, it didn't work. I got to become a member of it. It might've cost like \$12,000 or something. It wasn't - that's just, like, off the top of my head. You can look it up. It's called The 300 Club.

SC1.94 & QW.SC1.94

Getting People to invest in longevity discount club

I need education reform - I didn't tell you about the - remind me to tell you about the education reform. It's short and awesome. The 300. Oh. There is a discount club that they have marketed very well. I might be able to differentiate enough for it to not matter. I was thinking, the reason cryptocurrency isn't working is because - I'm just going to talk fast. Is it okay if I talk fast? I don't sound as cool, but whatever the fuck. You'll run out of attention span at some point anyway.

SC1.98 & QW.SC1.98

Global super intelligence

"If the world is a global super-intelligence, and the internet is it's nervous system, then when you do good sales, you're the motivation system for the giant global supercomputer."

R193

Sort me

Education

Jewish culture

The Jewish culture outperforms any other culture on the planet intellectually. I would say because their culture cares more than any other culture. They mandate, require and enforce marriage to smart people. Valuing smart people. Every Jewish mother's favorite thing in the world would be for her daughter to marry a good Jewish doctor.

What happens when you have a culture that one is rather isolationist and likes to keep it in the family, hyper focuses on savings and investment and hyper focuses on building of ideas and owning things. Well what you end up with is, probably, per capita, the wealthiest people and probably per capita the most intelligent people.

If you take some of those useful principles except, maybe skip the isolationism. Then execute them in other cultures, you should end up with less violent, wiser, more productive human beings. How easy would it be to cross-pollinate Jewish ideals the into other cultures? I'm not sure, but it might be worth trying.

R769

Weather data

If weather data is observed using digital sensors, and is actually an analog property, then wouldn't

it be intelligent to use a A-D converter to turn the data of the temperature sensor into bits that could be put through a DAC and turned into a real waveform that was truthful to the measurements of temperature, so that it would be easier to discover the shape of the heat energy "under the curve" thus it would be nice to see a nyquist limit theory of sampling frequency that would be most accurate for turning the digital measurements of the analog heat data, so that we would see charges of heat energy in analog shapes on our screens instead of a stupid graph which is nearly impossible to make intuitive sense with by looking at it.

If you didn't understand what that meant. Music is the movement of air, air pressure. Temperature is the movement of molecules. Sound and temperature are real world things that we measure, (sound is frequency and amplitude), and temperature is just temperature. So we take those measurements and we turn them into bits. We turn music into wav's and mp3's but poor old temperature, it just gets turned into shitty excel sheets. Why isn't temperature shown as a waveform like sound? There is no difference between showing the frequency and volume of sound on a waveplot or graph than doing the same with temperature, except its easier, because there's only one thing to measure, well you could include humidity and wind I guess. The point is, the resolution that we have to look at temperature data is far too low for the digital sensors that we use to measure it.

Retail websites

Reviews should have rating times number of ratings, and decay over time. Newer, more reviews, better reviews should out rank other shit. Better search options would fucking allow this manually.